

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Connecticut



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

170

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Connecticut's General Supervision System (GSS) is comprised of two focus areas:

1. Compliance monitoring
2. Program improvement

The following CSDE activities comprise the compliance monitoring prong of the GSS:

Data Collections:

The CSDE Performance Office conducts the data collections required under the IDEA. All data regarding children with disabilities are collected via multiple unique but "linked" data collection systems. Part of the state's responsibility for ensuring the accuracy of the federally reported data includes auditing the data reported by districts on students with disabilities. Districts are monitored according to a three-year monitoring cycle for the Parent Survey, Assessment Modifications/Accommodations Audit, and as needed, a focused IDEA compliance review (File Review).

Dispute Resolution Processes: Complaint Resolution Process

The complaint resolution process identifies and timely corrects noncompliance in an LEA's implementation of federal and state special education requirements and identifies components of an LEA's special education programming that need improvement (e.g., policies, procedures). The CSDE publication, Complaint Resolution Process, describes the complaint resolution process in detail. This publication can be found at the CSDE's web site.

Mediation

Mediation is a voluntary process offered to a parent and an LEA as a means to reach an agreement with respect to any matter relating to the proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education.

Advisory Opinions

Connecticut provides that any party that requests a due process hearing, may also request an advisory opinion. The advisory opinion regulations require the agreement of both parties to participate in the process. The process, which is completed in one day, allows the parties to state their positions to a hearing officer with limits on the number of witnesses the parties may present and the amount of time each party has to present their positions.

Due Process Hearings

The CSDE operates a single-tiered hearing system. That is, special education due process hearings are conducted at the state level; there is no local hearing. CGS Section 10-76h and its corresponding regulations establish the due process hearing system, which is managed by the CSDE. Hearing officers are appointed by the CSDE and approved by the State Board of Education. They may not be an employee of a public agency involved in the education or care of the child and may not have a personal or professional interest which would conflict with his or her objectivity in the hearing.

Fiscal Management

Mechanisms are in place to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B funds at the state and local level. In particular, the BSE collaborates with the Bureau of Fiscal Services (BFS) to ensure proper methods of administration are in place, such as: monitoring and enforcement of obligations imposed; technical assistance, as needed; adoption of promising educational techniques; sharing of successful practices; and correction of deficiencies through monitoring or evaluation. The CSDE ensures that audits of LEAs are conducted annually in accordance with the Single Audit Act. Regular review and follow up is completed to verify the LEA's correction of noncompliance and the Fiscal Review Team determines if further action is required. If a concern is identified and rises to the point of review, the BSE utilizes the IDEA Program/Fiscal Compliance Review Process to review Corrective Action plans to verify proper use of IDEA Part B funds as related to the fiscal requirements of the IDEA.

IDEA Compliance File Reviews

For this monitoring activity, CSDE staff annually review a random sample of special education documentation (including student IEPs) from approximately 60 Connecticut LEAs using a standardized rubric to verify compliance with IDEA requirements. All 170 Connecticut LEAs have been assigned to one of three cohorts and each cohort participates in this prescribed process on a 3-year rotating cycle that is aligned with other state survey and monitoring activities.

Significant Disproportionality

The IDEA requires states to collect and examine data on an annual basis to determine whether significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring in a district with respect to (1) the identification of children for special education and related services; (2) identification in six specific disability categories; (3) educational settings of less than 40 percent time with nondisabled peers and separate schools/residential facilities; and (4) discipline including in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions/expulsions, and total disciplinary removals. In Connecticut, the criteria used to determine those districts that demonstrate significant disproportionality in the four areas listed above includes: a relative risk index (RRI) equal to 3.0 and above for 3 consecutive years; a minimum cell size of 10; a minimum n-size of 30; and a reasonable progress standard of a 0.2 RRI reduction in both the second and third year of the analysis. A district that demonstrates significant disproportionality must review and revise, as necessary, its policies, procedure and

practices under in the area(s) of significant disproportionality and publicly report on the revision of policies, practices, and procedures. Additionally, the district must set-aside 15 percent of its total IDEA Part B funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS).

The following CSDE activities comprise the program improvement prong of the GSS:

Approval Process for Private Special Education Programs (APSEP)

Connecticut Regulations and Statutes grant the State Board of Education (SBOE) the authority to regulate and supervise the education of all children requiring special education who are residing in or attending any facility, private or public, receiving money from the state. In light of these statutory powers, the Commissioner of Education evaluates the suitability and efficacy of such private facilities prior to the disbursement of state funds and grants to local educational agencies utilizing such facilities for special education purposes. Principles adopted by the SBOE, which include specific standards, serve as the basis on which special education programs in private facilities (private programs) in Connecticut shall be approved. The principles are applicable to private programs in Connecticut-based private day and residential schools, hospitals, rehabilitation centers and treatment centers.

LRE Initiative

The CSDE gathers current data relative to disability category, time with nondisabled peers, race, age, gender, geographic region, prevalence rate and achievement scores data for students in the continuum of settings to examine trends and variables to understand causal factors. These data are reviewed to determine specific action steps and intervention levels for districts with data of concern.

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Connecticut's SSIP is focused on early literacy instruction and reading achievement. The foundation of the State's theory of action is the evidence-based practice of Data-based Individualization (DBI).

See the Indicator 17 section of this report for more information.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical assistance activities are critical for ensuring the implementation of IDEA requirements and distributing best practices to LEA personnel and families. The BSE conducts a number of technical assistance activities to help promote compliance and best practices in the provision of special education services across Connecticut.

For example, the BSE regularly publishes its Bureau Bulletin, which provides updates to LEA personnel and families regarding special education policy and practice, upcoming BSE activities and professional development and/or technical assistance opportunities. Additionally, the Bureau Chief of Special Education issues memoranda to special education directors regarding guidance about the provision of special education services or new/revised BSE practices. In a final example, the Commissioner of Education issues "C-Letters" to superintendents regarding guidance about education policy or new/revised CSDE practices.

The BSE works closely with the state's parent training and information (PTI) center which is currently administered by the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC). Weekly meetings between BSE and CPAC leadership allow for the regular exchange of information and ideas on how to best support LEAs and families by providing timely and meaningful TA. Furthermore, data on direct TA to families provided by CPAC staff is collected by the PTI Center and reviewed monthly during the school year by the entire BSE staff as a means to identify trend issues and develop appropriate supports.

The BSE also provides a great deal of technical assistance directly to LEA personnel and families regarding the provision of special education services through telephone and e-mail contacts. The BSE has developed an organization system to manage the voluminous number of contacts received each week through a "BSE Contact List". Each BSE consultant accepts contacts from a group of LEAs in order to ensure the timely response to inquiries and establish a regular contact between the BSE and LEA personnel and families from a particular district. These communications serve as an opportunity to provide technical assistance, establish a collaborative relationship between the CSDE and its constituents and promote both compliance and best practices regarding special education processes and services. Finally, as needed, BSE consultants conduct trainings for LEA administrators and personnel on specific topics related to special education.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

The CSDE recognizes the importance of high quality professional development offerings for district personnel. The CSDE also recognizes the importance of parent/family training to empower parents and families in their role in the special education process. Therefore, the CSDE partners with the State Education Resource Center (SERC), the Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) Alliance, the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) and other organizations to ensure that regularly scheduled, relevant professional development offerings and parent/family trainings are available to the public to address various topics (both compliance-focused and results-focused) related to special education.

During FFY 2020, a comprehensive professional learning opportunity titled "Connecticut IEP Quality Training" was developed and piloted. This series of trainings includes both synchronous and asynchronous modules that cover topics such as Quality IEP Development, Secondary Transition, Progress Monitoring, Prior Written Notice, and Parent Training.

The CSDE's Differentiated Monitoring and Support Team looks regularly at the patterns and trends across monitoring activities and uses the information to plan appropriate future offerings with the SERC, the RESC Alliance, and other service delivery providers.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR

content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.

- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

29

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Twenty-nine of sixty-six (44%) SPP/APR stakeholder group members were parents.

Additional parent input was obtained through the CPAC Leadership Group, AFCAMP, Commissioner's Roundtable on Family Engagement, CT State Advisory Council, and SEPTOs. Parent members in these groups were engaged in informing targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in the following ways: Live Virtual Sessions, Surveys, Small Group Discussions, Focus Groups, Instant Polls, Mentimeter, Padlet, Poll Now, and a "Q and A" forum with CSDE/CPAC/SEPTO/SERC.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The CSDE engaged in a series of activities to prepare Connecticut parents to meaningfully contribute to this process. Our layered approach began with intentional activities to increase our capacity as an SEA. We strategically partnered with and trained our State Education Resource Center and Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center to provide a broad foundation of understanding of the SPP/APR in order to support parents across our State. Utilizing this increased capacity, we began to hold regional and targeted informational sessions to provide parents with an overview of the requirements.

Once basic understanding was addressed, our data manager provided anticipated data targets and guided analysis for our indicators which we grouped in the following manner:

1. Preparing students with IEPs for life after high school (indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14)
2. CT students with IEPs performance in key areas (indicators 3 and 7)
3. CT students with IEPs learning alongside their peers and dispute resolution outcomes (indicators 5, 6, 15, and 16)
4. Meaningful participation in the ppt process (indicators 8, 11, and 12)
5. Special education identification and suspension/expulsion processes (indicators 4, 9, and 10)
6. Improving Reading Outcomes for Students with Disabilities (Indicator 17)

During these sessions CSDE consultants provided parents with the indicator language, related definitions, and measurement requirements in order to fully "unwrap" each of indicators and support the participants' full understanding and meaningful participation in the process. Parent stakeholders were provided the opportunity advise us on target setting for the results-based indicators. After foundational capacity building was addressed during data target setting activities, improvement strategy sessions were held. During these sessions CSDE consultants provided parents with brief review of the indicators being addressed and also a comprehensive summary of past, present, and future improvement strategies. Suggestions and recommendations on improvement strategies data analysis, and evaluation of progress were solicited from the group. Each session was recorded to allow participants to view the session again, if needed.

All sessions were held virtually and offered during morning and afternoon hours. Resources were provided in English and Spanish. Parents who were unable to attend live sessions were provided with recorded webinars. Webinars were housed on a CANVAS Platform. Finally, the CSDE's SPP/APR website (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR>) was utilized to inform, engage parents, and solicit feedback. Parents were provided with stipends for their participation in the process.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

On September 8, 2021, the CSDE's BSE and SERC launched its first virtual SPP/APR Stakeholder Group "Kick Off" event. Morning and afternoon sessions were held to provide the public with a review of the SPP/APR stakeholder process followed by a question-and-answer (Q&A) session.

Twenty-one stakeholder meetings were held between September 21, 2021 and January 20, 2022. Duplicative sessions were held on each presentation day—one in the morning and one in the afternoon—each session was recorded and posted on Canvas for participants' review. For each stakeholder meeting that focused on analyzing data and setting data targets a subsequent stakeholder session was held focused on improvement strategies and the evaluation of each indicator presented in the former data meeting.

Below is a description of each stakeholder meeting including dates, focus areas, and indicators presented. Note: each improvement strategy and evaluating progress session began with a brief review of the former data analysis and data target session. A morning and afternoon session was held for each date in the timeline below:

September 21, 2021 Data Analysis and Target Setting Meeting 1

September 29, 2021 Improvement Strategies and a Plan for Indicator Evaluation Meeting 2

Theme: Preparing students with IEPs for Life After High School. Indicators: Graduation (indicator 1), Drop out (indicator 2), Secondary transition (indicator 13), and Post school outcomes (indicator 14).

October 5, 2021 Data Analysis and Target Setting Meeting 3

October 13, 2021 Improvement Strategies and a Plan for Indicator Evaluation Meeting 4

Theme: CT Students with IEPs Performance in Key Areas. Indicators: Preschool Outcomes (indicator 7), Assessment (indicator 3)

October 19, 2021 Data Analysis and Target Setting Meeting 5

October 27, 2021 Improvement Strategies and a Plan for Indicator Evaluation Meeting 6

Theme: CT Students with IEPs Learning Alongside Their Peers and Dispute Resolution Outcomes. Indicators: Least Restrictive Environment (LRE indicator 5), Preschool LRE (indicator 6), Resolution Sessions (indicator 15), and Mediations (indicator 16).

November 9, 2021 Data Analysis and Target Setting Meeting 7

November 18, 2021 Improvement Strategies and a Plan for Indicator Evaluation Meeting 8

Theme: Meaningful Participation in the PPT Process. Indicators: Parent Involvement (indicator 8), Evaluation Timelines (indicator 11), and Free Appropriate Public Education at 3 (FAPE indicator 12).

December 7, 2021 Data Analysis and Target Setting Meeting 9

December 16, 2021 Improvement Strategies and a Plan for Indicator Evaluation Meeting 10

Theme: Special Education Identification and Discipline Processes. Indicators: Suspension / Expulsion (indicator 4), Disproportionate Representation (indicator 9), and Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories (indicator 10).

January 12, 2022 Data Analysis, Target Setting and Improvement Strategies Meeting 11

Theme: Improving Reading Outcomes for Students with Disabilities (Indicator 17)

January 20, 2022 Summative Review of the SPP/APR Stakeholder Process Meeting 10. Theme: Updated Resources As A Result OF The Stakeholder Input Process. A review of the stakeholder input process over the past four months, in addition to an introduction of the revised SPP/APR website (along with new website resources) were provided. Ongoing ways to share feedback were provided and a final survey was announced for participants to engage in (summarizing the effectiveness of the SPP/APR stakeholder meetings and seeking stakeholder input).

Context on data targets for both compliance and results-based indicators were introduced to participants by the CSDE's Part B Data Manager and lead of Special Education Analyses within the CSDE's Data Analysis, Research, and Accountability office. For each results-based indicator, stakeholders were presented with historical trends in the data, current factors affecting the data, and a rationale for three suggested data targets (presented as options A, B, or C).

Stakeholders then had an opportunity to informally share their initial thinking by engaging in a Poll-Now to select option A, B, or C as a data target for each results-based indicator. More formal input was solicited via break out groups during the virtual presentations and post-presentation Qualtrics-based surveys that were disseminated to the group.

Each SPP Indicator is managed by a CSDE Education Consultant. These "Indicator Managers" presented improvement strategies related to each indicator. Stakeholders provided input on improvement strategies for each indicator via documented breakout group discussions or whole group discussions in addition to follow up feedback via Qualtrics surveys.

Additionally, student feedback was solicited as a means of public input via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. On December 14, 2021, 20 students were provided with an overview of the SPP/APR and its indicators, data targets, and improvement strategies. Students engaged in an interactive discussion with the CSDE's, Special Education Division Director. Participants discussed indicators of interest (graduation, suspension/expulsion, transition) and had opportunities to ask relevant questions, share comments, and record feedback via an online Padlet that was later reviewed by CSDE staff and then archived as a part of the CSDE's public resources available under the Additional Resources section (Youth Advisory Feedback) of the CSDE's SPP/APR website (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR>).

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

As of January 2022, The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR>) has been updated to include the results of SPP/APR stakeholder process on target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation.

The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The CSDE reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the state on the targets in the SPP/APR through the District Annual Performance Reports. The FFY 2019 District APR reports were posted on the CSDE's website at: (<http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do>) From the top navigation menu: (Select > Overview - Select > Special Education Annual Performance Reports).

In May 2021, the State's updated SPP/APR was posted in the Special Education section of the CSDE Web site at: (<http://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR/Documents>).

Information regarding the the FFY 2019 District Annual Performance Reports and revised SPP/APR was provided to each LEA, the state's parent training and information (PTI) center, and various parent/advocacy organizations throughout the state.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	85.74%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	70.30%	72.90%	75.60%	78.20%	78.20%
Data	65.56%	65.21%	66.71%	64.95%	67.80%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	87.65%	85.00%	85.00%	85.50%	85.50%	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.

- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,727
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	43
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	20
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	603

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,727	5,393	67.80%	87.65%	87.65%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Graduation with a regular high school diploma is defined as receipt of Connecticut’s approved state issued diploma. Graduation with a General Educational Development (GED) or a Certificate of Completion does not constitute graduation with a regular high school diploma. For the classes graduating from 2004-2022, a minimum of twenty credits is required for graduation with a regular high school diploma, including no fewer than four of which shall be in English, not fewer than three in mathematics, not fewer than three in social studies, including at least a one-half credit course on civics and American government, not fewer than two in science, not fewer than one in the arts or vocational education and not fewer than one in physical education. For the class of 2023 and each graduating class thereafter, a minimum of twenty-five credits is required for graduation with a regular high school diploma, including not fewer than nine credits in the humanities, including civics and the arts, not fewer than nine credits in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, not fewer than one credit in physical education and wellness, not fewer than one credit in health and safety education, not fewer than one credit in world languages, and a one credit mastery-based diploma assessment. The same rules are applicable for youth with IEPs.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It is important that the reader not compare the current data reported for SY 2019-2020 to the presented historic data in the prepopulated chart. The prepopulated historic data are based upon the old 4-year cohort rate graduation calculation. With the new requirements in the OSEP APR Measurement Table, the historic data do not reflect the graduation rate definition now required in this indicator.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	12.02%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	14.00%	13.60%	13.30%	13.00%	12.70%
Data	15.52%	12.85%	12.50%	12.69%	13.11%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	11.18%	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received

in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.

- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,727
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	43
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	20
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	603

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
603	5,393	13.11%	11.18%	11.18%	Met target	N/A

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The dropout definition for students with disabilities is consistent with the rules used for all Connecticut students. Specifically, students who drop out are defined as: (1) 16-and 17-year-old students who notify the school of their intention to withdraw, with parental permission; (2) 18-year-old students who notify the school of their intention to withdraw; (3) students who enroll in a GED program; and (4) students who withdraw from the school, without notifying the district, and for whom no transfer information or transcript is requested by another school.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It is important that the reader not compare the current data reported for SY 2019-2020 to the presented historic data in the prepopulated chart. The prepopulated historic data are based upon the old 4-year cohort rate dropout calculation. With the new requirements in the OSEP APR Measurement Table, the historic data do not reflect the dropout rate definition now required in this indicator.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	92.70%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	86.10%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	68.72%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	92.78%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	83.63%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	70.16%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state’s Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner’s RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	6,108	6,850	6,151
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,889	4,635	1,395
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,386	897	2,493
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	387	366	339

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	6,027	6,743	6,029

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,069	3,106	1,397
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,135	2,165	2,493
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	388	368	340

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,662	6,108		95.00%	92.70%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,898	6,850		95.00%	86.10%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,227	6,151		95.00%	68.72%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,592	6,027		95.00%	92.78%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,639	6,743		95.00%	83.63%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,230	6,029		95.00%	70.16%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Student-Assessment/Main-Assessment/Statewide-Summative-Assessment-Results-2020-21>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	15.28%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	13.90%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	19.86%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	12.91%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	6.55%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	7.48%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.00%	15.50%	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%	17.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	13.00%	13.75%	14.50%	15.25%	16.00%	16.75%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	19.50%	20.00%	20.50%	21.00%	21.50%	22.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%	17.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.00%	6.75%	7.50%	8.25%	9.00%	9.75%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.00%	7.50%	8.00%	8.50%	9.00%	9.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the

submission of the SPP/APR.

- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,275	5,532	3,888
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	656	695	211
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	150	74	561

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,204	5,271	3,890
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or	573	321	90

above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	99	24	201

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	806	5,275		15.00%	15.28%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	769	5,532		13.00%	13.90%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	772	3,888		19.50%	19.86%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	672	5,204		12.00%	12.91%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	345	5,271		6.00%	6.55%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	291	3,890		7.00%	7.48%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Student-Assessment/Main-Assessment/Statewide-Summative-Assessment-Results-2020-21>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	27.39%
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	19.13%
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	37.76%
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	28.09%
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	42.39%
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	36.47%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	27.00%	28.00%	30.50%	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	19.00%	20.00%	22.50%	25.00%	27.50%	30.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	28.00%	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.50%	47.00%	48.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	35.00%	35.50%	36.00%	36.50%	37.00%	38.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state’s Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner’s RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	387	366	339
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	106	70	128

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	388	368	340

b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	109	156	124
---	-----	-----	-----

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	106	387		27.00%	27.39%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	70	366		19.00%	19.13%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	128	339		37.00%	37.76%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	109	388		28.00%	28.09%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	156	368		42.00%	42.39%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	124	340		35.00%	36.47%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Student-Assessment/Main-Assessment/Statewide-Summative-Assessment-Results-2020-21>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	31.84
Reading	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	37.46
Reading	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	39.51
Math	A	Grade 4	FFY 2020	27.37
Math	B	Grade 8	FFY 2020	28.20
Math	C	Grade HS	FFY 2020	29.63

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	42.00	42.00	42.00	41.50	41.00	31.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	46.00	46.00	46.00	45.25	44.50	37.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	46.00	46.00	46.00	45.25	44.50	39.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	40.00	40.00	40.00	39.50	39.00	27.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	40.00	40.00	40.00	39.50	39.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	36.00	36.00	36.00	35.50	35.00	29.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.

- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	34,607	36,799	32,997
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,275	5,532	3,888
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	16,157	18,828	19,027
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	150	74	561
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	656	695	211
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	150	74	561

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	34,525	35,942	33,137
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,204	5,271	3,890
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13,808	12,464	12,095
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	99	24	201
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	573	321	90
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	99	24	201

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.28%	47.12%		42.00	31.84	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	13.90%	51.37%		46.00	37.46	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	19.86%	59.36%		46.00	39.51	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12.91%	40.28%		40.00	27.37	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.55%	34.74%		40.00	28.20	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.48%	37.11%		36.00	29.63	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	21.30%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	9.50%	9.50%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Data	6.47%	6.47%	7.65%	9.41%	8.24%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	5.00%	5.00%	20.00%	15.00%	12.50%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	170	8.24%	5.00%	2.35%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For Indicator 4A, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) determined that a district had a significant discrepancy by comparing the suspension/expulsion rates for children with individualized education programs (IEPs) among districts in the state. The state calculated the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs for each district within the state. Connecticut has defined "significant discrepancy" as a district suspending or expelling greater than 2 percent (2.0%) of its children with disabilities for more than 10 days in a school year. Connecticut does not use a minimum "n" size for this analysis, and no districts were excluded from the calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The CSDE analyzed district suspension and expulsion data submitted electronically through the ED 166 Discipline data system. CSDE consultants from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation, the Bureau of Special Education, and the Office of Student Support Services met to review district suspension and expulsion data and the process for addressing districts with a significant discrepancy. The CSDE contacted the 4 districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The CSDE conducted the review outlined in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.170(b) by requiring districts to provide additional data and information to the CSDE through a self-assessment. The completed self-assessment addressed the district's policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. CSDE staff reviewed the self-assessments through a desk audit and clarified any self-assessment responses with individual districts.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

13

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5	0	157	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Connecticut's methodology compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. In Connecticut, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is defined as follows: Greater than 2% of students with disabilities in a district suspended or expelled out-of-school (OSS) for any serious offense for a cumulative total of greater than ten days in a school year by race.

We established a state ratio bar of 2% in order to compare suspension rates among districts. We then calculated a suspension rate by race in each district for students with disabilities and compared those rates to the students with disabilities that had suspensions and expulsions greater than a cumulative total of 10 days by race in each district.

Connecticut applied a minimum "n" size requirement in the calculation of significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs:

- Minimum of 5 students with disabilities in the district were suspended/expelled for > 10 days (Rule A)
- Minimum of 10 students with disabilities in the district in each race category (Rule B)

In the 2019-20 school year, 5 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the suspension/expulsion rate of children with disabilities of greater than 10 days in a school year. The districts' policies, procedures or practices were reviewed to ensure compliance with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Zero districts were found to have non-compliant policies, procedures or practices. Target met.

Connecticut's minimum 'n' size requirement excluded 13 districts from the calculation of rates. Districts excluded under minimum "n" Rule A = 13. Districts excluded under minimum "n" Rule B = 0 Districts. Therefore the number of districts assessed for Significant Discrepancy = 157 Districts. The number of districts with rates > 2.0% = 5 Districts. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) analyzed district suspension and expulsion data submitted electronically through the ED166 Discipline data system. CSDE consultants from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation, Division of Family and Student Support Services and the Bureau of Special Education reviewed suspension and expulsion data and the process for addressing districts with a significant discrepancy. Data for Indicator 4B are not taken from sampling. Data collected are valid and reliable, as ensured through a series of verification checks after the electronic submission of the data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The CSDE contacted the districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs by race or ethnicity. The CSDE conducted the review outlined in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.170(b) by requiring districts to provide additional data and information to the CSDE through a self-assessment. The completed self-assessment addressed the district's policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. CSDE staff reviewed the self-assessments through a desk audit and clarified any self-assessment responses with individual districts. Upon completion of the desk audit, the CSDE determined that each of the districts had policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that were in compliance with the regulatory requirements. Therefore, the CSDE did not require any of the districts to revise its policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA. The CSDE completed the review of the identified districts and there were no districts that had significant discrepancies due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.10%	68.20%
A	67.50%	Data	67.74%	67.33%	67.69%	66.75%	67.50%
B	2019	Target <=	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	6.00%	6.00%
B	6.64%	Data	5.21%	5.50%	5.67%	6.11%	6.64%
C	2019	Target <=	8.40%	8.40%	8.40%	8.30%	8.30%
C	7.34%	Data	8.35%	8.03%	7.88%	7.69%	7.34%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	67.00%	67.25%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%
Target B <=	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%
Target C <=	7.30%	7.25%	7.20%	7.15%	7.10%	7.05%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.

- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	78,393
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53,023
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,566
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	5,343
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	171
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	175

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53,023	78,393	67.50%	67.00%	67.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,566	78,393	6.64%	7.20%	7.10%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5,689	78,393	7.34%	7.30%	7.26%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019, the state of Connecticut opted to be an early adopter of the inclusion of five-year-olds in Kindergarten in the FS002 School Age CWD file. OSEP reported that it accepted this revised baseline of FFY 2019 in the APR. Therefore in this FFY 2020 APR, Connecticut's FFY 2019 baseline is appropriate. OSEP's response from the Connecticut FFY 2019 APR is below.

"The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618."

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	77.25%	77.50%	77.75%	78.00%	78.00%
A	Data	72.62%	72.64%	71.18%	69.65%	64.49%
B	Target <=	11.25%	11.00%	10.75%	10.50%	10.50%
B	Data	15.07%	16.43%	18.28%	19.00%	22.51%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were

designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.

- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	64.49%
B	2019	22.51%
C	2020	0.54%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	65.00%	60.00%	61.50%	63.00%	64.50%	66.00%
Target B <=	22.20%	25.00%	24.50%	24.00%	23.50%	22.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,336	3,322	104	5,762

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,463	2,236	67	3,766
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	543	664	17	1,224
b2. Number of children attending separate school	22	25	4	51
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	17	14	0	31

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,766	5,762	64.49%	65.00%	65.36%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,276	5,762	22.51%	22.20%	22.15%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	31	5,762		2.50%	0.54%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	54.00%	55.50%	57.00%	58.50%	85.00%
A1	58.30%	Data	46.05%	73.25%	88.80%	89.75%	89.68%
A2	2008	Target >=	50.00%	51.50%	53.00%	54.50%	68.00%

A2	54.20%	Data	43.04%	68.66%	71.99%	71.20%	65.76%
B1	2008	Target >=	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	85.00%
B1	61.70%	Data	70.17%	85.77%	91.61%	90.84%	90.58%
B2	2008	Target >=	31.00%	31.50%	32.00%	33.50%	68.00%
B2	33.00%	Data	47.96%	68.97%	74.25%	73.24%	70.21%
C1	2008	Target >=	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	90.00%
C1	50.50%	Data	59.42%	80.00%	95.96%	96.21%	96.73%
C2	2008	Target >=	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	65.00%
C2	26.50%	Data	33.59%	57.50%	68.79%	69.04%	62.99%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%
Target A2 >=	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%
Target B2 >=	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Target C1 >=	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%
Target C2 >=	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered

slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,300

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	95	2.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	101	3.06%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	925	28.03%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	422	12.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,757	53.24%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,347	1,543	89.68%	85.00%	87.30%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,179	3,300	65.76%	63.00%	66.03%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	341	10.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	5	0.15%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	710	21.52%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,032	61.58%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	212	6.42%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	2,742	3,088	90.58%	85.00%	88.80%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
<i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,244	3,300	70.21%	66.00%	68.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	64	1.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	31	0.94%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,178	35.70%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,159	35.12%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	868	26.30%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,337	2,432	96.73%	93.50%	96.09%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,027	3,300	62.99%	60.00%	61.42%	Met target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

The CSDE’s decisions regarding data analysis and reporting are based upon the validity of the Brigance items which provide reference points for skills and behaviors expected of children within certain age bands. The Brigance test items are a result of extensive research and multiple validation studies. The items within each sub-test of the Brigance IED-III are hierarchically ordered to reflect the typical developmental trend of the increasing acquisition of children’s skills over time.

In order to assist test administrators with the interpretation of results when the test is administered as a criterion referenced assessment, certain items within each sub-test were determined by the developers of the Brigance IED-III to serve as age-specific benchmarks of skill acquisition. In conjunction with information gathered from validation and standardization studies, the Brigance IED-III developers determined the developmental age notations

ascribed to specific items by compiling information from a comprehensive research base in the area of infant and early childhood development (a detailed bibliography is provided on pages 292-294 of the Brigance IED-III assessment).

The ages (in months) ascribed to specific items increase from benchmark item to benchmark item. This corresponds to and reflects the hierarchical order of the items within each sub-test. Due to the inclusion of age-related benchmark items, the Brigance IED-III permits conclusions to be drawn about a child's performance on a sub-test relative to their chronological age and provides for comparison of skills and behaviors expected of a child's chronological age.

The CSDE uses the instrument's age-related benchmarks to determine comparable to same-age peers in the data analysis.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) established a statewide data system to collect data on the developmental and functional progress of 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with IEPs in the preschool grade. Information obtained through a statewide data collection system are used to report on the three early childhood outcome measurement areas: positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships; acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy; and use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs. The CSDE selected a single statewide assessment instrument, the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development III© (Brigance), a criterion-referenced assessment instrument, for the collection and reporting of early childhood outcome data.

The CSDE selected a subset of Brigance sub-tests which correlate to the early childhood outcome questions for federal reporting. The CSDE sent the list of selected sub-tests to the Brigance IED-III test developer and publisher for review and approval. Feedback from both the developer and publisher of the Brigance IED-III was that the sub-tests selected were sufficiently varied and representative of the instrument, hence not compromising either the intent or the integrity of the instrument and were felt to sufficiently answer the federal questions regarding child progress. The Brigance subtests selected by the CSDE are required to be administered to all children 3, 4 and 5-years of age with an IEP entering the preschool grade and receiving special education and related services. The assessment, specifically the state's required sub-tests of the assessment instrument, are used to collect data at a child's entry to and exit from special education at the preschool grade level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.

- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	83.62%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	87.50%	87.75%	88.00%	88.25%	85.00%
Data	81.28%	87.55%	85.92%	83.62%	87.42%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,987	4,662	87.42%	85.00%	85.52%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Connecticut does not use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children. All parents of students ages 3-21 are included in the survey. All surveys were collected in the same manner from all parents regardless of the age/grade of the student with disabilities. There are no issues with the combination of data because the surveys are identical, and all procedures for distribution and collection were also identical. No data were combined because all data were obtained from one survey, one administration and one database.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

20,165

Percentage of respondent parents

23.12%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	23.45%	23.12%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The CSDE Bureau of Special Education contracted with the Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) for assistance with the data collection, data analysis, and report writing. In 2021, the Connecticut Part B Parent Survey was distributed to a stratified, random sample of 20,165 parents of students ages 3-21 receiving special education services. A total of 4,662 surveys were returned for a statewide response rate of 23.12 percent. Parents with only mailing addresses were sent information via mail with a paper copy of the survey. Parents with an email address and mailing address were emailed the survey and received a paper copy of the survey in the mail at the same time. A total of 3,845 (82%) respondents completed the survey online and 817 (18%) respondents completed the survey by mail. The online survey was available in English and six other languages while the paper survey was available in two languages: English and Spanish. Surveys were received from families in five of the six offered languages. Furthermore, every local district surveyed in this year's sample had at least a 9% response rate, with response rates varying from 9-44 percent. In previous years there have always been 1-3 districts with zero respondents. This improvement is a direct result of the additional mail/text and phone outreach implemented over the last two years. Connecticut has historically struggled with response rates in the teens, however, for the past two years through the extensive efforts of TAESE, Connecticut has demonstrated response rates of 23 percent statewide. This increase is very exciting but is even more thrilling considering that the last two surveys were completed during the world-wide COVID pandemic.

Connecticut is currently in the process of building a new statewide data system. With the launch of this new system, the state will have immediate access to the most current and up-to-date contact information for all families. In previous years, the state conducted a separate collection of contact information for selected families in the survey sample. However, this collection was conducted in the winter prior to late spring survey outreach by the vendor. This process to obtain parent contact information resulted in out-of-date mailing addresses and phone numbers before the survey was ever sent. Therefore Connecticut's long-term plan to increase the response rate will be implemented with the spring 2023 survey when the state has access to the most up-to-date contact information. We expect that access to the most current and up-to-date contact information will address the inability to reach families in our cities that are housing fragile and more likely to change addresses multiple times throughout the school year.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

While a parent survey regarding the perception of schools to support parents' involvement in their student's education is not generally seen as a topic that would result in nonresponse bias (NRB), NRB can still occur for several reasons. First, surveys that are poorly designed often lead to nonresponses. For this reason, Connecticut uses 25 items from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Item Bank for this survey. Since these survey items have been designed and researched using the highest standards in instrument design, we can conclude the survey itself is not a reason for NRB. Next, having a select group of parents responding to a survey by failing to reach all members of a population may also contribute to NRB. Connecticut's extensive outreach prior to survey distribution via mail, telephone and email along with provision of the survey in six languages is specifically designed to counter this type of NRB. Furthermore, since the use of multiple mediums has been shown to increase survey response rates and prevent NRB, the survey is made available in a variety of formats including mail, paper, email, and text. The length of survey collection periods can also impact response rates. Connecticut's survey is collected in several phases over the course of several weeks with multiple reminders to non-responsive families about the importance of completing the survey. While it's not always possible to completely eliminate the effects of NRB, it's possible to minimize the effects by using a smart survey design and distribution methodology. Connecticut's survey is designed to be relatively short and require minimal time and effort to complete and submit. Furthermore, the survey is distributed in such a manner that it reaches and is accessible to the vast majority of the identified population. Lastly, Connecticut extensively communicates about the importance and confidentiality of the survey with families as per recommended practice in NRB avoidance.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

Disability / Survey / Statewide / Difference

LD ----- 29.4% / 34.3% / -4.9%
 ID ----- 3.3% / 3.2% / 0.1%
 ED ----- 4.9% / 6.7% / -1.8%
 SLI ----- 12.6% / 12.4% / 0.2%
 Other ----- 13.2% / 10.5% / 2.7%
 OHI ----- 19.1% / 19.4% / -0.3%
 Autism ---- 17.5% / 13.5% / 4.0%

Gender / Survey / Statewide / Difference

Male ---- 66.1% / 66.1% / 0.0%
 Female -- 33.9% / 33.9% / 0.0%

Race/Ethnicity / Survey / Statewide / Difference

AI/AN ----- 0.1% / 0.2% / -0.1%
 Asian ----- 3.4% / 2.5% / 0.9%
 Black ----- 7.5% / 15.5% / -8.0%
 White ----- 62.6% / 45.4% / 17.2%
 Hispanic ---- 22.3% / 32.4% / -10.1%
 NH/OPI ----- 0.1% / 0.1% / 0.0%
 2+ Races --- 4.0% / 3.9% / 0.1%

The responses collected from 56 districts in this year's survey sample were analyzed for representativeness by disability, gender, and race/ethnicity as compared to the total statewide population of students with disabilities. The state's analysis of representativeness of respondent parents used both a +/- 6% discrepancy as well as a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a practical or meaningful significance test (effect size).

The +/- 6% discrepancy test of Disability identified no concerns with the representativeness of respondent parents. Additionally, disability was further examined for practical significance using an effect size statistic which supports a very weak and non-concerning difference between the disabilities of all children in CT and that of the students of the 2021 Parent Survey Respondents. The analysis of representativeness by gender also revealed no differences between the two groups using both methodologies.

The analysis of representativeness by race and ethnicity, however, did indicate concerns in the respondent sample. Survey respondents were under-representative of Black and Hispanic/Latino families and over-representative of white/Caucasian families of students with disabilities in Connecticut. This determination was supported by both the +/- 6% discrepancy and the effect size statistic.

Notwithstanding the statistical evidence for racial disparities in the representativeness of our survey respondent parents, it is interesting to note that the black and Hispanic/Latino families that did respond to the survey were more likely to agree that report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. In fact, the states overall agreement was 85.52%, yet parents of black students with disabilities agreed 86.49% of the time and parents of Hispanic/Latino youth agreed 88.15% of the time. Families of students with disabilities identifying as white only reported 84.78% agreement. Therefore, the overrepresentation of white respondent families technically lowered the states overall reported data related to facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

In the immediate, Connecticut will slightly alter the sample so that the selection includes more families from our urban centers. Currently, we census survey all parents from most districts and conduct a simple random sample of 33 districts (11 districts per cohort cycle). Under the approved sampling design, we survey 39 percent of all urban district families of students with disabilities in our 33 largest districts. By increasing our survey distribution to 50 percent in these districts we should be able to reach more of our under-represented black and Hispanic families.

In addition, Connecticut is in the process of building a new state-wide electronic special education system that will be required for all districts. Under our existing data collection, the state collects our 10/1 child count data through a stand-alone system from each of our district vendor systems and we only collect the data necessary for all regulatory state and federal collections. Therefore, our parent contact information is collected via a separate outreach with districts in an excel spreadsheet. Our current contact information is incomplete, subject to human error and not collected in a reasonable timeframe associated with the mailing. With the launch of our new system in 2022-23, CT will have access to all parent contact information on an on-demand basis. This new capability should ensure cleaner and more comprehensive contact information within a tighter timeline for provision to our survey vendor. Which in-turn, should allow Connecticut to reach more families, when there is less of a gap in the timeline from collection to mailing. This new system should eventually have a direct impact on our response rates.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The state's analysis of representativeness of respondent parents used both a +/- 6% discrepancy as well as a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a practical or meaningful significance test (effect size). See Connecticut's response to "the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services" for a complete description of our metrics.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Connecticut Special Education Parent Survey: Sampling Plan
2021-2022 through 2025-2026

Connecticut is continuing to use the same stratified random sampling approach with a combination of census and simple random sampling of parents of students with disabilities within each participating district. All 170 districts in Connecticut (CT) responsible for the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004) have been placed into one of three cohorts. The cohort design was purposeful and stratified to ensure that the cohort of districts included in any given year would be representative of the state overall.

District stratification is based upon enrollment size, racial demographics and regional "feeder" school alignment. For example, CT's largest urban school districts were randomly assigned first so that Hartford, Waterbury and Bridgeport were each included in different cohorts; this process continued for CT's nine large urban districts. The second step of the district stratification and random assignment occurred with regional school districts (e.g., Regional School District #4, which is a grade 7-12 secondary-only district serving the feeder towns of Chester, Deep River and Essex, which are preschool through grade six districts, were each purposefully assigned to the same cohort). Step three of the stratification used racial demographics and enrollment to randomly assign the remaining school districts to each of the three cohorts. At each step of assignment, each cohort was monitored to ensure representativeness of the cohort was maintained for the variables of age, race/ethnicity, grade, gender and disability type. When designing this system, we stratified the districts by all required breakout variables including age, race/ethnicity, grade, gender and disability type. We then used that stratification to place districts into one of the three cohorts and further tested the cohort's representativeness against the breakout variables for multiple years of child count data to ensure that when using any year of state data each cohort would continue to be representative at the state level. The process tested positively in each of the last eight survey years.

CT will be maintaining our survey as a mailing to approximately 20,000 families per year. Oversampling occurs in a new three-year cohort cycle in two ways. In the new process, CT will census mail surveys to 70 (previously 80) percent of our districts in each cohort cycle. Previously there were only 33 districts, in total, across all three cohorts that did not receive a census mailing to every family of a child with a disability. Moving forward, 51 districts that will be sampled. This means that for the 51 districts where a simple random sample is drawn for survey mailing, we increase the number of surveys sent over that of previous years (from approximately 39 to 50 percent of all district students with disabilities in our 51 largest districts). For a district like Hartford, in previous years approximately 1500 families were sent surveys, under the new cohort cycle nearly 1900 families will be included in the parent survey mailing. This design is purposeful oversampling of our under-represented black and Hispanic families. CT is confident in the statistical merit of this approach.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state of Connecticut adopted the same formula for assessing significant disproportionality for this indicator. We are calculating a risk ratio and applying a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum N-size of 30. These minimums do not exclude a district from the calculation, they simply trigger the required use of the alternate risk ratio when the cell or N-size is violated for the comparison group. Upon violation, the district-level data are compared to the state-level data. The threshold for the identification of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than or equal to 3.0. We are only using one year of data for the assessment of disproportionate representation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Each year, the CSDE requires districts with identified disproportionate representation (i.e., RR's greater than or equal to 3.0) to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using a state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon a desk audit review of each district's responses to the 52 indicators of the self-assessment by CSDE staff, it is determined if each of the districts is correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and has appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. If the CSDE finds that the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, the CSDE would report the finding in its SPP/APR and assign corrective actions accordingly.

For FFY 2020, zero districts were contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition because zero met the numeric criteria for further review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state of Connecticut adopted the same formula for assessing significant disproportionality to this indicator. We are calculating a risk ratio and applying a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum N-size of 30. These minimums do not exclude a district from the calculation, they simply trigger the required use of the alternate risk ratio when the cell or N-size is violated for the comparison group. Upon violation, the district-level data are compared to the state-level data. The threshold for the identification of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than or equal to 3.0. We are only using one year of data for the assessment of disproportionate representation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Each year, the CSDE requires districts with identified disproportionate representation (i.e., RR's greater than or equal to 3.0) to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using a state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon a desk audit review of each district's responses to the 52 indicators of the self-assessment by CSDE staff, it is determined if each of the districts is correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and has appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. If the CSDE finds that the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, the CSDE would report the finding in its SPP/APR and assign corrective actions accordingly.

For FFY 2019, 13 districts were initially contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition in 13 identified areas. The CSDE required the 13 districts to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using the state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon review of the self-assessment by CSDE staff via desk audit, it was verified that each of the districts was correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and had appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices; and that the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of black.

4 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of Hispanic.

2 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of white.

4 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Learning Disabled.

2 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Speech/Language Impairment.

2 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Other Health Impairment.

2 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Intellectual Disabilities.

3 of the 13 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Emotional Disturbance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	93.48%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.27%	99.11%	99.58%	93.48%	96.97%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13,866	13,661	96.97%	100%	98.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

205

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Evaluations for a total of 205 children did not meet the state 45-school day timeline. The range of days beyond were from 1 to 192. There were several reasons for evaluations to not be completed within the timeline.

First and foremost, the majority of evaluations were late because of circumstances related to COVID-19 and school classroom closures in the interest of public safety during the pandemic. The extended school classroom closures created an extreme backlog of testing and PPT meetings to complete in a short period of time at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year. This created scheduling conflicts, and additionally, many students and/or staff were unavailable for testing due to quarantine requirements. Furthermore, most districts returned to school in September under a hybrid model of instruction which further reduced the opportunity for teams to conduct testing as in some cases students only attended school in-person two days per week. However, not all late evaluations were due to COVID closures. Other late timelines were due to: independent evaluations not being completed on time; inability to access multi-lingual evaluators or assessment instruments for non-native English speakers.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Pursuant to Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) §10-76d-13, once a district receives a written referral for special education evaluation, it has 45-school days to complete an initial evaluation, exclusive of the time required to obtain parental consent. The State timeline encompasses the entire eligibility determination process including reviewing the referral, obtaining written parental consent for evaluation, conducting a comprehensive evaluation, determining eligibility, obtaining written parental consent for the provision of special education services and implementing an individualized education program (IEP) if the student is found eligible.

Exceptions for going beyond the timeline include the following:

- Documented request by parent to reschedule or delay the eligibility determination PPT meeting after agreeing to attend at a particular time and date.
- Parent repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation.
- Student hospitalized/extended absence with medical documentation that student was not available for evaluation.
- Student placed in diagnostic placement for the purpose of determining eligibility.
- Eligibility Determination PPT cancelled due to inclement weather/emergency closing.
- Child referred from the Birth to Three system, had a 90-day transition conference, and either had an IEP in place by their 3rd birthday or was found not eligible.
- Documented agreement to extend the evaluation timeline for the purpose of determining a Specific Learning Disability (ED637 form).

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data used to report Indicator 11 are statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that is responsible for the provision of special education and related services. Data are not obtained from sampling. Data reported for this indicator are valid and reliable. Evaluation Timelines data are collected annually from all districts via a web-based data collection tool. Data are collected for all children for whom consent to evaluate was received, including children placed by parents in private, non-public, and religiously affiliated schools, between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
54	54	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There were 54 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2019 (2019-20) evaluation timelines data.

All 54 districts were required to submit statements of assurance that each had reviewed its policies, procedures and practices specific to conducting and completing initial evaluations for any factors that may have contributed to untimely completion of initial evaluations and submit any revisions for review by BSE staff via desk audit.

The 54 districts were also required to provide monitored submissions of subsequent evaluation timelines data during 2020-21 for review by CSDE staff. During the monitored submission process, all 54 districts reached the 100% target for timely initial evaluations and were found to be implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.301 and Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Section 10-76d-13, which the CSDE verified using the special education SIS database.

Through the actions detailed above, the CSDE was able to verify within one year that each of the 54 districts is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for initial evaluations, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

There were 54 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2019 (2019-20) evaluation timelines data.

The 54 districts were required to submit to the CSDE the following information for each child determined eligible beyond the timeline during FFY 2019:

- the student's State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID);
- dates of referral, written parental consent for evaluation, and review of evaluation results;
- the reason for the delay;
- the extent to which the delay may have resulted in the denial of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE), if any; and
- any action items taken to address the late evaluation and IEP implementation.

The CSDE used the special education SIS database to verify that the initial evaluation was completed (and an IEP implemented for every student determined eligible for special education and related services and for whom the parent provided written consent for the provision of services) for each of the 348 children whose initial evaluation exceeded the state timeline. BSE staff also reviewed any actions taken by the district to address the late evaluation and IEP implementation such as compensatory education or services, staff training, or revisions to clerical procedures.

Through the actions detailed above, the CSDE was able to verify within one year that each of the 348 initial evaluations was completed, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	91.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,722
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	833

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,950
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	384
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	194
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	358

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,950	1,953	100.00%	100%	99.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

3

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

All three children were late due the impact of COVID School Closure time periods. Additionally, families were uncomfortable bringing children in for testing. Two of the three students turned three during the school closure time and had PPTs convened immediately upon schools reopening in the fall. In the case of one student, the district struggled to engage the parent to bring the student in for testing for several months before the pandemic closed schools, which further exacerbated the inability to implement the IEP in a timely fashion. Students were late between 138 and 313 days in total.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data used to report on this indicator represent the statewide data collected from every school district in the state that provides special education and related services to the population of eligible students beginning at age 3. No sampling was utilized for reporting on this indicator. Data are valid and reliable as verified by a series of validation checks built into the statewide data collection system.

The statewide special education data collection system is called the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). Data utilized were obtained by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) through the electronic submission of special education data by each school district in the state. Data submitted are child-specific with each child having a unique student identification number called a State Assigned Student Identification Number (SASID). The CSDE began assigning a SASID number to all children in the state's Part C program in the school year 2006-07. By the school year 2007-08, all infants and toddlers receiving Part C services had a SASID assigned by the CSDE. That student identification number assigned by the CSDE stays with the child during the receipt of their early intervention services and is reassigned to the child by the CSDE at age 3 or at whatever age and point in time the child becomes enrolled and begins receiving a public education.

Data used in the analysis reflect the Section 618 data that identifies the number of 3-year-old children receiving special education and related services. The CSDE's data system also captures the date of the child's individualized education program (IEP) team meeting that is held to develop the child's initial IEP along with the start date of a child's special education and related services. The Part C lead agency's data are used as data verification to ensure that the data analysis and reporting is fully inclusive of all students who exit Part C to Part B.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	77.80%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.93%	99.87%	99.92%	99.97%	99.91%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
16,253	16,346	99.91%	100%	99.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data utilized to report on this indicator are statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that provides special education and related services. These data are collected annually through Connecticut’s Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). SEDAC collects multiple variables that allow the state to monitor individualized education program (IEP) compliance with Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) including: use of age appropriate transition assessments; postsecondary goals and annual IEP goals and objectives related to individualized student transition services needs (including course of study); evidence that the student was invited to the Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting; and evidence that participating agencies were invited to the PPT meeting, where appropriate. Data were not obtained from sampling, secondary transition data are collected for every student with an IEP who is 15 years of age or older (will be 16 at the next annual review PPT), as well as for students with the primary disability of Autism who are 13 years of age or older (will be 14 at the next annual review PPT). See below for further details. All data reported here are valid and reliable.

In the above reported indicator data, the State saw an overall decrease of 0.5 percent of transition-age youth with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition. The number of students with noncompliant IEPs increased from 15 in FFY 2019 to 93 in FFY 2020. The State efforts to monitor all areas of IDEA compliance, beyond that of indicator data, identified that the increase in transition non-compliance was due to the impact of COVID-19 and the districts’ difficulty in convening annual review PPT meetings. Each student of transition eligible age without a properly convened annual review PPT had the student record cited for noncompliance for all of the transition components as well as the late annual review. The state is currently monitoring the correction of all identified noncompliance for each of these students. Prior to the global pandemic, this additional level of monitoring of annual review PPT impact on transition compliance was not necessary.

Detailed information regarding the SEDAC data collection can be found at the following location:
<http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/help/sedac/default.aspx>.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

IMPORTANT NOTE: Included in this indicator are data for all youth with the primary disability of Autism who are age 14 and over and all other students with disabilities aged 16 and over. The box above only allows a number; not an explanation that the 14 year old state rule only applied to one disability category in Connecticut for the FFY 2020.

The Connecticut Legislature passed Public Act No. 19-49, An Act Concerning Transitional Services for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder, which amends subdivision (9) of subsection (a) of Section 10- 76d of the Connecticut General Statutes and requires that: “The planning and placement team shall, in accordance with the provision of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 USC 1400, et seq., as amended from time to time, develop and update annually a statement of transition service needs for each child requiring special education. Commencing no later than the date on which the first individual education program takes effect for a child who is at least fourteen years of age and diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, such program shall include (A) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment and, where appropriate, independent living skills; and (B) the transition services, including courses of study, needed to assist a child in reaching those goals. The individual education program shall be updated annually thereafter in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision.”

The data for students with Autism, ages 14 and 15, are reported within this indicator and combined with the data for all other students with disabilities ages 16 and over.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

For the ten districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2019, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) verified within the one-year timeline that all districts are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (34 C.F.R. Sections 300.320(b) and 300.321(b)) through a review of subsequent data in the state’s special education data system, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The ten districts were required to review student files to determine the underlying cause(s) of noncompliance and submit a brief summary of the findings of this investigation, as well as a plan for addressing the cause(s) of noncompliance, for review by CSDE staff. Additionally, each district was also required to submit a statement of assurance that it had reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices specific to providing measurable postsecondary goals and annual goals and objectives, including inviting the student to the Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting where transition services were being discussed, and if appropriate, inviting a representative from an outside/participating agency to the PPT meeting, for any factors that may have contributed to inappropriate transition services and submit any changes or revisions for review by CSDE staff. Each district was also required to provide evidence of training for all staff members who were responsible for the oversight, development, or implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs) that include appropriate post-secondary transition goals and annual goals which address the accurate and thorough completion of IEPs with particular attention to the secondary transition sections of the IEP - pages 4, 5, 6, and 7 – specifically information on pages 8 – 16 of the revised IEP Manual and Forms, and on pages 49 - 52 of Connecticut’s Special Education Data Application and Collection Handbook-Reference Guide. In addition, each district was required to participate in a CSDE technical assistance (TA) session, differentiated and tailored to each district, based on their area(s) of noncompliance, which included training on the use of following CSDE Indicator 13 resources and tools: Secondary Transition Planning IEP Checklist, Secondary For Transition Planning IEP Checklist - District Summary, and IEP Rubric for Scoring Secondary Transition Planning.

The CSDE used the special education database to verify that the ten districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (34 C.F.R. Sections 300.320(b) and 300.321(b)), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. CSDE staff also reviewed any actions taken by the district to address the development of an IEP with coordinated, measurable, post-secondary and annual goals and transition services, including inviting the student to the PPT meeting where transition services are discussed and if appropriate, inviting a representative from an outside/participating agency, such as staff training, the development of a "checks and balance" review system of secondary IEPs, or revisions of clerical or data collection procedures.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For the ten districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2019, CSDE personnel worked closely with district personnel to immediately correct individual cases of noncompliance. In all cases, individual correction occurred and was verified through a review of student individualized education programs (IEPs) within the one-year timeline, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

For each individual case of noncompliance, districts were required to:

1. Convene a Planning and Placement Team meeting for the purpose of reviewing and revising the student's IEP as well as for transition planning and correcting the area of noncompliance. In some cases the correction required a revision to the required elements of the student's IEP and in other cases it required an action to be taken by the district and then appropriately documenting that action on the IEP. The areas of secondary transition addressed through required corrective actions for individual cases were: a. the inclusion of appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessments, b. transition services, including course of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs, c. evidence that the student's preferences and interests were considered in transition planning, d. evidence that the student was invited to the PPT meeting, and e. evidence that the district invited, with the prior written consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority, a representative of any outside agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying transition services for the student.
2. Update the special education data base for every student with a noncompliant IEP under this indicator; and
3. Submit the updated IEP pages to the CSDE to verify the correction of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.10%	80.00%
A	44.78%	Data	46.66%	51.34%	86.40%	90.21%	90.95%
B	2020	Target >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.10%	85.00%
B	92.86%	Data	65.24%	66.62%	91.60%	94.78%	93.71%
C	2020	Target >=	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	78.75%	90.00%
C	97.43%	Data	78.74%	79.23%	95.32%	96.08%	96.14%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	45.00%
Target B >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	93.00%
Target C >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	97.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.

- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	5,380
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,852
Response Rate	71.60%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,725
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,852
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	70
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	106

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,725	3,852	90.95%	40.00%	44.78%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,577	3,852	93.71%	85.00%	92.86%	N/A	N/A

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	3,753	3,852	96.14%	95.00%	97.43%	N/A	N/A

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	39.29%	71.60%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In FFY 2017, the CSDE contracted with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to obtain higher education enrollment and persistence data for our exiting students with disabilities. In FFY 2018, the process by which LEAs send exit contact information for the CT Post-School Outcome Survey (PSOS) to CSDE, captured using the Summary of Performance (SOP), was modified to a data collection via the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC) system. This process was continued in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. In FFY 2019, the CSDE made additional changes to its Indicator 14 data collection process in an effort to further increase overall response rate, as well as the representativeness of responders. First, the PSOS, and all subsequent materials were translated into Spanish. Second, the online survey and online learning module include additional accessibility features for exiters (i.e., subtitles/closed captioning, low vision mode). In FFY 2020, the CSDE worked with the CT Department of Labor (DOL) to obtain employment and wage information on students with disabilities who exited in 2019-2020 and may have been employed since exiting school. Moreover, the CSDE IDEA Part B Data Manager and the Indicator 14 Lead are members of and have participated in the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: the Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 14 Community of Practice.

Through all of these efforts, CT has seen our response rates increase from below 15% before FFY 2017 to 71.6% in FFY 2020. Furthermore, we now have a respondent pool that is representative of the demographics of all youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, across all demographic areas.

The next step in CT's long range plan to improve the response rate is the implementation of a new statewide special education data system. Connecticut is currently in the process of building a new statewide data system. With the launch of this new system, the state will have immediate access to the most current and up-to-date contact information for exiting students. In previous years, the state conducted a separate collection of contact information for all exiting students. However, this collection was conducted in the winter after students had already exited and prior to late spring survey outreach by the vendor. This process to obtain contact information resulted in out-of-date mailing addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers before the survey was ever sent. Therefore, Connecticut's long-term plan to increase the response rate will be implemented with the spring 2023 survey when the state has access to the most up-to-date student contact information. We expect that access to the most current and up-to-date student contact information will help to address the inability to reach some exited students with disabilities.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

While a survey regarding the activities of students after exiting from high school is not generally seen as a topic that would result in nonresponse bias (NRB), NRB can still occur for several reasons. First, surveys that are poorly designed often lead to nonresponses. For this reason, Connecticut uses 12 items that have been designed and researched using the highest standards in instrument design, we can conclude the survey itself is not a reason for NRB. Next, having a select group of people responding to a survey by failing to reach all members of a population may also contribute to NRB. Connecticut's extensive outreach prior to survey distribution via mail, telephone and email along with provision of the survey in two languages is specifically designed to counter this type of NRB. Furthermore, since the use of multiple mediums has been shown to increase survey response rates and prevent NRB, the survey is made available in a variety of formats including mail, paper, email, text, and telephone interview. The length of survey collection periods can also impact response rates. Connecticut's survey is collected in several phases over the course of several weeks with multiple reminders to non-responsive exiters about the importance of completing the survey. While it is not always possible to completely eliminate the effects of NRB, it is possible to minimize the effects by using a smart survey design and distribution methodology. Connecticut's survey is designed to be very short and require minimal time and effort to complete and submit. Furthermore, the survey is distributed in such a manner that it reaches and is

accessible to the vast majority of the identified population. Lastly, Connecticut extensively communicates about the importance and confidentiality of the survey with exited students as per recommended practice in NRB avoidance, which is clearly reflected in our 71.6% response rate.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Disability / Survey / Statewide / Difference

LD ----- 44.4% / 40.9% / 3.5%
 ID ----- 2.8% / 3.3% / -0.5%
 ED ----- 13.5% / 15.0% / -1.5%
 SLI ----- 2.7% / 2.6% / 0.1%
 Other ----- 3.2% / 4.5% / -1.3%
 OHI ----- 26.2% / 25.4% / 0.8%
 Autism ---- 7.2% / 8.3% / -1.1%

Gender / Survey / Statewide / Difference

Male ---- 63.3% / 65.1% / -1.8%
 Female -- 36.7% / 34.9% / 1.8%

Race/Ethnicity / Survey / Statewide / Difference

AI/AN ----- 0.3% / 0.3% / 0.0%
 Asian ----- 1.6% / 1.5% / 0.1%
 Black ----- 16.9% / 17.8% / -0.9%
 White ----- 51.6% / 49.5% / 2.1%
 Hispanic ---- 27.0% / 28.2% / -1.2%
 NH/OPI ---- 0.1% / 0.1% / 0.0%
 2+ Races --- 2.5% / 2.5% / 0.0%

Exit Reason / Survey / Statewide / Difference

Certificate ---- 0.5% / 0.8% / -0.3%
 Dropout – 8.0% / 11.2% / -3.2%
 Graduate ----- 91.2% / 87.6% / 3.6%
 Max Age – 0.3% / 0.4% / -0.1%

The responses collected from 71.6 percent of youth in this year’s exiting population were analyzed for representativeness by disability, gender, race/ethnicity, and exit reason as compared to the total statewide population of exiting students with disabilities. The State’s analysis of representativeness of respondent youth used both a +/-6% discrepancy, as well as a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a practical or meaningful significance test (effect size).

The +/- 6% discrepancy test of all four areas identified zero concerns with the representativeness of respondent youth. Additionally, all areas were further examined for practical significance using an effect size statistic which supports a negligible to very weak and non-concerning difference between all demographics of exiting youth with disabilities and those of the exited respondents.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The State’s analysis of representativeness of respondent youth used both a +/- 6% discrepancy, as well as a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a practical or meaningful significance test (effect size). See Connecticut’s response to “Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.” for a complete description of our metrics.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	62
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	40

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.

- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.

- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	45.07%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.10%	52.00%
Data	30.43%	55.29%	57.14%	60.19%	50.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	40.00%	25.00%	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.10%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
40	62	50.00%	40.00%	64.52%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	180
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	47
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	97

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate

information.

- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.70%	68.70%
Data	68.77%	63.33%	61.88%	66.96%	75.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	68.65%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
47	97	180	75.00%	50.00%	80.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Established in Phase One of the SSIP, Connecticut's SiMR is as follows:

Increase the reading performance of all third-grade students with disabilities (SWDs) statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Special-Education/SPP/CT-Part-B-State-Systemic-Improvement-Plan.pdf>

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The 2020–21 school year presented a unique set of challenges, as many of Connecticut's students spent a significant part of the year learning remotely. In light of these circumstances, the USED approved the CSDE's request to waive accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for a second consecutive year. The SiMR data are directly derived from the State's approved ESSA Accountability Index. Consequently, there are no FFY 2020 data available for this report.

Still, despite on-going disruptions to learning due to the pandemic, the CSDE felt it was vital to reaffirm Connecticut's commitment to equity and administer all statewide assessments during the 2020–21 school year. Having these scores allows for the monitoring of long-term trends and the evaluation of the full impact of the pandemic on student achievement and growth. It also provides accurate data to target support and resources where they are most needed to address and combat the negative impact of this pandemic on student learning. The 2020-21 Statewide Summative Assessment Results can be accessed at <https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Student-Assessment/Main-Assessment/Statewide-Summative-Assessment-Results-2020-21>.

To support attendance and engagement of students as they participated in varied school learning models (i.e., in-person, hybrid, remote), the CSDE established a new system to collect district learning model data on a weekly basis and student-level attendance data on a monthly basis in 2020–21. The weekly collection allowed the CSDE to strategize and support districts locally with local boards. The monthly collecting of attendance and the separate reporting of in-person and remote days for each student allowed for the CSDE to provide targeted supports (e.g., roundtables, webinars, guidance, and the Learner Engagement and Attendance Program [LEAP]), to research and publish attendance-related findings with Attendance Works that informed policy discussions nation-wide, and to group students based on their predominant learning models. Moreover, these groupings facilitated the evaluation of 2020–21 summative assessment results by student learning model. The 2020-21 Attendance Data can be accessed at <https://edsight.ct.gov/relatedreports/Supporting Student Participation in 2020-21.html>.

An analysis of these attendance and assessment data indicates the following:

Attendance Patterns

- Nearly one-quarter of students were fully/mostly in-person (i.e., more than 75 percent of school days or at least 16 out of an estimated 20 school days in an average month were in-person), nearly half of students were hybrid learners (i.e., between 25 and 75 percent of school days were in-person), and nearly one-quarter of students were fully/mostly remote (i.e., below 25 percent or fewer than 5 out of an estimated 20 school days in an average month were in-person).
- While the CSDE stressed the importance of in-person learning for students with IEPs and those students received in-person instruction at a higher rate than other students, some students with high needs (e.g., those who are English learners and/or are from a low income family) tended to be fully remote at greater rates than their peers. Specifically, a greater proportion of English learners (10.8 percent), students eligible for free meals (12.1 percent), and students who are experiencing homelessness (16.7 percent) were fully remote for the entire school year as compared to the state average (7.6 percent).

Test Participation

- A new remote testing approach was implemented with fidelity; 11.5 percent of Grade 3-8 students tested remotely. Pursuant to CSDE analyses, only results from tests administered in-person are used in these analyses.
- In-person test participation was strong overall.
- Nearly 82 percent of Grade 3-8 students tested in-person (which was strongly recommended) on Smarter Balanced; 11.5 percent of students tested remotely.
- In-person test participation was strongest for students who learned fully/mostly in-person (97%) or in hybrid (95%) model. Conversely, only 37 percent

of fully/mostly remote learners took the exams in-person, while 45 percent of fully/mostly remote learners took the Smarter Balanced exams remotely. The CSDE confirmed that at the state-level, the demographics of those who tested in-person are reasonably similar to those who tested remotely or not at all, so as to allow for these analyses and related inferences.

Assessment Results

- During the pandemic, in all grades and most student groups, students who learned fully/mostly in-person lost the least ground academically while those who learned in hybrid or fully/mostly remote models showed substantially weaker achievement and growth.
- This pattern held true for students with high needs and students without high needs. A similar pattern is seen in all grades and most student groups.
- While the academic impacts were seen in all subjects, the observed differences were largest in math.
- Estimated statewide results from Connecticut’s growth model further indicate the following:
- Growth before the pandemic was much stronger than growth during the pandemic.
- Among low- and high-achieving students, those learning in-person showed greater growth than those learning in hybrid or remote models.
- During the pandemic, students below proficiency (Levels 1 and 2) grew at lower rates than those above proficiency; this was not the case before the pandemic.
- Students above proficiency (Levels 3 and 4) who learned in-person neared pre-pandemic growth in ELA but not in Math.

At the time of this submission, the CSDE has maintained its plan to administer on-grade summative assessments (the state summative assessments for students in Grades 3-8 and 11) in the spring of 2022.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	51.50%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target=>	47.50%	47.50%	47.50%	48.50%	49.00%	51.60%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Numerator-Sum of all third grade SWDs' individual ELA Performance Index points	Denominator-Total count of ELA participating third grade SWDs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
			47.50%		N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The USED approved the CSDE’s request to waive accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-21 school year. The SIMR data are directly derived from the State’s approved ESSA Accountability Index. Consequently, there are no FFY 2020 data available for this report.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The USED approved the CSDE’s request to waive accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-21 school year. The SIMR data are directly derived from the State’s approved ESSA Accountability Index. Consequently, there are no FFY 2020 data available for this report.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

The 2020–21 school year presented a unique set of challenges, as many of Connecticut’s students spent a significant part of the year learning remotely. In light of these circumstances, the USED approved the CSDE’s request to waive accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for a second consecutive year. The SIMR data are directly derived from the State’s approved ESSA Accountability Index. Consequently, there are no FFY 2020 data available for this report. At the time of this submission, the CSDE has maintained its plan to administer on-grade summative assessments (the state summative assessments for students in Grades 3-8 and 11) in the spring of 2022 and expects to complete the accountability index analysis which will provide the CSDE with the needed SIMR data.

As a result of not having FFY 2020 SIMR data available, the CSDE focused its efforts on providing resources, guidance, technical assistance, and professional learning opportunities to support districts, educators, and families navigate the 2020-21 school year. Additionally, the Bureau of Special Education in partnership with AIR developed and piloted a professional learning series: IEP Quality Training. See "Additional Implementation Activities."

In June 2020, the CSDE provided Sensible Assessment Practices for 2020-21 and Beyond (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/COVID-19/SensibleAssessmentPractices.pdf>) to offer guidance to educators on how to use available data to “assess” their incoming students when schools re-opened in September without necessarily having to test them.

Also in June 2020, the CSDE issued Adapt, Advance, Achieve: Connecticut’s Plan to Learn and Grow Together (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/COVID-19/CTReopeningSchools.pdf>) to offer guidance and considerations to LEAs as they were planning to operate in three instructional models during the 2020-21 school year, full in-school, hybrid, and full remote, which was grounded in six guiding principles: 1) Safeguarding the health and safety of students and staff; 2) Allowing all students the opportunity to return to school full time starting in the fall; 3) Monitoring the school, students, and staff and, when necessary, potentially canceling classes in the future to appropriately contain COVID-19 spread; 4) Emphasizing equity, access, and support to the students and communities that are emerging from this historic disruption; 5) Fostering strong two-way communication with partners such as families, educators, and staff; and 6) Factoring into decisions about reopening the challenges to the physical safety, social-emotional well-being, and the mental health needs of our students when they are not in school.

In July 2020, the CSDE issued Fall Reopening Resource Document for Students with High Needs (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/COVID-19/Addendum-3-Fall-Reopening-Resource-Document-for-Students-with-High-Needs.pdf>) to assist school districts and school programs when planning to support students with high needs during the upcoming school year. In August 2020, the CSDE issued Reopening Guidance for Educating Students with Disabilities (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/COVID-19/Addendum6-Reopen-Guidance-for-Educating-Students-with-Disabilities.pdf>) to provide further guidance to districts related to the education of students receiving special education and related services within the school reopening framework, which included a Learning Model IEP Implementation Plan (LMIIP) framework for districts to use to fulfill their obligation to provide IEP services during COVID-19, while operating in three different instructional models.

In March 2021, the CSDE launched AccelerateCT: Connecticut’s Framework for Accelerating Educational Opportunity and Access (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/AccelerateCT/AccelerateCTFramework.pdf>), a bold redesigned educational response to learning in order to promote renewal, reduce opportunity gaps, accelerate learning, and advance equity to allow for the most effective response to the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The AccelerateCT framework provided a step-by-step process for preK-12 school system leaders to guide the local strategic analysis of work to create equitable inclusive environments. The AccelerateCT framework required intentional implementation of high-quality instruction, engaging and rigorous curricula, and connections to social-emotional learning to support all learners. Strategic acceleration actions can empower students to build knowledge, skills, and behaviors that promote academic and social success. It was imperative that special education teams be included in planning for acceleration of learning within the school district to ensure that students with IEPs had access to such opportunities and that IEPs continued to align with the curriculum and content standards being addressed. Planning and Placement Teams (PPTs) needed to consider whether the student required additional accommodations and/or modifications to access and make progress in the acceleration programming.

In May 2021, the CSDE also issued Guidance Regarding Special Education Recovery for Students with IEPs due to the COVID-19 Pandemic (available at <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Digest/2020-21/SpecialEducationRecovery.pdf>). The purpose of this guidance was to provide school districts and PPTs with a process to determine whether and to what extent special education recovery is appropriate for students with IEPs. The goal of this process was to revise students’ IEPs, when necessary, to address any existing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, while also establishing a solid foundation from which to move forward as we continue to navigate the pandemic. Of note, COVID-19 related federal funding programs required particular attention to the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on certain student subgroups, including students with disabilities. Therefore, the CSDE encouraged school districts to leverage those resources as they planned to implement this guidance.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.

Connecticut's THEORY OF ACTION

IF:

- District and school leaders commit to improving the reading performance of students with disabilities;
- Qualified personnel provide district staff with training in DBI, reading instruction and progress monitoring;
- Appropriate materials are used for targeted instruction and intervention; and
- A coaching model is used to support K-3 school staff working with students with disabilities in DBI practices.

THEN:

School district special education and intervention staff members will:

- Understand DBI theory, processes, and practices;
- Implement targeted and individualized reading instruction with fidelity;
- Follow effective progress monitoring practices; and
- Use data to inform the adjustment of reading interventions as needed.

RESULTING IN:

- Improved reading performance of third-grade students with disabilities.

Connecticut's SSIP EVALUATION PLAN is based on the following three evaluation questions:

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent is the SSIP project improving state-level capacity for supporting districts and schools in implementing and scaling-up evidence-based practices to improve reading for students with disabilities?

The SSIP continues to be a lever to improve Department practices. Most prominently, the SSIP's focus on improving early literacy results for SWD prompted a revision to the content of the State's primary professional learning initiatives for early literacy instruction – ReadConn and CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI). While instruction for SWD was always present in the ReadConn initiative for participants, the increased intra-agency collaboration at

the state-level has supported coordinated efforts between the BSE and the Academic Office to make the inclusion of SWD in the PL activities and materials more explicit. Additionally, the CK-3LI is an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools, which includes setting priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including SWDs and English Learners (ELs). Similarly, there has been a coordination of efforts between the BSE and Turnaround Office to provide the State's Opportunity Districts (the ten lowest performing districts) with support. BSE staff are now included in the internal review meeting process as well as meetings with district personnel to review and discuss the districts' improvement efforts this year. Additionally, the BSE staff are members of the DBI Leadership Team, which is responsible for the development of the CONNi4/DBI project structures, including recruiting school districts for the project, providing professional development for the chosen school districts, developing templates for supporting the DBI process with students, and creating a coaching system to provide ongoing support to districts.

Evaluation Question 2: To what extent is the SSIP project enhancing district-and school-level capacity for implementing and sustaining evidence-based practices to improve reading for students with disabilities?

As stated previously, the content of the ReadConn initiative was revised to include more specific information on reading instruction for SWD, and the CK-3LI focuses on improving reading outcomes for K-3 students, including SWDs. The CONNi4 project is an intensive, individualized PL support for district cohorts, beginning in the 2021-22 school year. The focus areas for these activities included best practices in literacy assessment, including data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis; the use of scientific, research-based literacy interventions and instruction through a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS); and the use of the evidence-based practice, data-based individualization (DBI).

Evaluation Question 3: To what extent is the SSIP project increasing the reading performance of third-grade students with disabilities statewide?

The CONNi4/DBI project will analyze the reading performance of all third-grade students with disabilities statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index, the State's SiMR, as well as results from universal screening and progress monitoring assessments for third-grade students with disabilities from districts in the CONNi4 project, as part of the DBI process.

The State's THEORY OF ACTION and EVALUATION PLAN can be found on the State's SSIP webpage, which is accessible at <https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Systemic-Improvement-Plan-SSIP>.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The previous infrastructure improvement strategies of developing and maintaining a Web-based repository of resources, providing ongoing professional learning (PL), and engaging in intra-agency collaboration continued during FFY 2020; however, due to COVID-19, the CSDE needed to adjust the focus of these activities to address the challenges the state was facing.

SSIP Leadership Team

The CSDE formed an SSIP Leadership Team, to increase the collaboration between the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) and the Academic Office, as well as other internal CSDE colleagues and external partners; share expertise, research, and resources; support the the State's SSIP; plan PL opportunities to build capacity on reading/literacy strategies for SWDs; and support local education agencies (LEAs) as they work toward improving the reading performance of third grade students with disabilities (SWDs) – Connecticut's SiMR. There were a variety of existing initiatives in the state that are coordinated by the BSE and Academic Office and directly relate to and support the SSIP. The CSDE's infrastructure has improved through the development of an SSIP Leadership Team. The regularly scheduled virtual meetings has allowed the CSDE colleagues to discuss the content, implementation, and effectiveness of these initiatives, and restructure existing and create new activities in order to ensure that CSDE initiatives continue to evolve in a way that best supports the reading instruction of SWDs in the state. Through this collaborative effort, the SSIP Leadership Team worked to develop and maintain the Web-based repository of resources, plan for ongoing PL opportunities, and support the Connecticut Intensive Intervention Implementation Initiative (CONNi4) project, which will support LEAs in implementing the data-based individualization (DBI) process.

Online TA and Resource Library

While previous SSIP-related resources focused almost solely on evidence-based reading instruction and intervention, it was necessary to broaden the scope of this work in order to support districts by providing strategies and resources for conducting evaluations and implementing IEPs remotely; holding virtual IEP Team meetings, ensuring equal access to remote instruction for high needs students; and professional learning for school district staff in the use of technology, remote instruction, progress monitoring and assessment. Collaboration across the agency to support families was another critical component of this work over the past year as many parents and caregivers became facilitators of their student's education while they were receiving instruction remotely. An intra-department approach to formulate a strategy, develop resources, and provide technical assistance has been utilized over the past year. The BSE worked collaboratively with the CSDE's Academic Office, Turnaround Office, Performance Office, and Office of Student Supports, as well as external partners such as the State Education Resource Center(SERC), the Connecticut Alliance of Regional Educational Service Centers (RESC Alliance), and the state's parent training and information (PTI) Center in order to provide TA and online resources.

Ongoing Professional Learning

In its effort to build capacity statewide to address the needs of students with reading difficulties, including those identified with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) and SLD/Dyslexia, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, made the following nine online webinars available for free during the FFY 2020 school year to districts statewide. Webinars 1-3 are included in an online module for educator preparation programs (EPPs) statewide (see #10 below).

1. Increasing Awareness of SLD/Dyslexia: Implications for CT Educators
2. Using Literacy Screening Data to Support Students with Reading Difficulties
3. Remediating and Accommodating Students with SLD/Dyslexia at the Secondary Level
4. Identifying Students with SLD/Dyslexia: An Online Module
5. It's Never Too Late: How to Motivate and Teach Older Struggling Readers with SLD/Dyslexia
6. Case Study Review of a CT Student with SLD/Dyslexia
7. SLD/Dyslexia: Connecting Research to Practice in Connecticut
8. Identifying Students who are Gifted and Talented and Have SLD or SLD/Dyslexia
9. Distinguishing Between Typically Developing English Learners and Students with Reading Difficulties
10. Online Module for EPPs

The CSDE, in collaboration with the RESC Alliance, sponsored six cohorts of the series: "Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills" during the FFY 2020 school year. Participants in that free, virtual workshop learned systematic, structured methods for teaching decoding, encoding, oral, and written

expression to students with learning disorders and specific language disabilities.

Additionally, as part of its Structured Literacy Program Training Series, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, provided the following sixteen training sessions during the FFY 2020 school year, fourteen trainings were made available virtually to district personnel across the state and two trainings were made available virtually to district personnel from districts that had been identified for continued TA and support through the State's SSIP work.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training (4 sessions: 3 statewide sessions and 1 SSIP district session)
2. Wilson – Just Words Virtual Launch Workshop (2 statewide sessions)
3. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program (6 sessions: 5 statewide sessions and 1 SSIP district session)
4. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (2 statewide sessions)
5. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking (2 statewide sessions)

CONNi4/DBI Project Leadership Team

The DBI Leadership Team meets weekly to prepare for and monitor the progress of the Connecticut Intensive Intervention Implementation Initiative (CONNi4) / data-based individualization (DBI) project. Members of the DBI Leadership Team include BSE staff members and researchers at the University of Connecticut (UConn). During DBI Leadership Team meetings, project planning occurs, including the creation of a conceptual model that provides an overview of the CONNi4 project and DBI process; the DBI Readiness Assessment, based on the National Center on Intensive Intervention tool, used in the recruitment of districts/schools; the deliverables, timeline, and outcomes of the project; and information and communications regarding the SSIP/SiMR and CONNi4/DBI project to be shared with stakeholders, including the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group, State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), and CT's PTI Center. The conceptual model contains the four project stages aligned with implementation science to ensure that research is translated into the everyday practice setting with success. These stages include: exploration, preparation, implementation, and sustainment. During DBI Leadership Team meetings, the group discusses the importance of aligning this initiative to the practices currently in place in the school-based settings (described above). For example, the literacy interventions implemented and the progress monitoring measures used will be those in which the district educators have already received training.

Additionally, the UConn Research Team meets weekly to prepare for the weekly DBI Leadership Team meetings. The Research Team is hiring a programmer to develop a web-based application to support School DBI Teams with DBI planning and the implementation of the DBI process. The Research Team is also recruiting for a DBI Advisory Board consisting of practitioners working in elementary school and/or district settings from across the state to provide expert feedback to further inform the iterative development of project tools and resources and ensure alignment to current school practices.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

SSIP Leadership Team

The regularly scheduled virtual SSIP Leadership Team meetings have allowed the CSDE colleagues to discuss the content, implementation, and effectiveness of these initiatives, and restructure existing and create new activities in order to ensure that CSDE initiatives continue to evolve in a way that best supports the reading instruction of SWDs in the state. Through this collaborative effort, the SSIP Leadership Team worked to develop and maintain the Web-based repository of resources, plan for ongoing PL opportunities, and support the Connecticut Intensive Intervention Implementation Initiative (CONNi4) project, which will support LEAs in implementing the data-based individualization (DBI) process.

Online TA and Resource Library

The following list highlights some of the content resulting from this improvement strategy and the associated metrics illustrate the short-term outcomes that were achieved, from 07/01/2020 to 06/30/2021.

- Professional Support Webinar Series for Districts Page views: 5,232
- Professional Support Webinar Series for Families Page views: 2,070
- Sensible Assessment Practices for 2020-21 and Beyond Downloads: 477
- Sensible Assessment Practices Webinar Series Page views: 2,836
- CTLearning Hub Page views: 28,474
- Resources to Support Student Learning During School Closures Due to COVID-19: Volume 1 (includes content specific resources to support student learning organized by both discipline and grade band including English/Language Arts for grades K-3) Downloads: 627
- Resources to Support Student Learning During School Closures Due to COVID-19: Volume 2 (expanded content specific resources and general resources to support remote learning) Downloads: 115
- Resources to Support Student Learning During School Closures Due to COVID-19: Volume 3 (resources around student data privacy, grading practices, assessment, and professional learning) Downloads: 65
- Resources to Support Student Learning During School Closures Due to COVID-19: Volume 4 (guidance on a three-tiered model of scientific research-based instruction (SRBI), SRBI resources, and MTSS-behavioral resources) Downloads: 110
- Adapt, Advance, Achieve: Connecticut's Plan to Learn and Grow Together Downloads: 13,941
- Addendum 3: Fall Reopening Resource Document for Students with High Needs Downloads: 1,170
- Addendum 6: Reopening Guidance for Educating Students with Disabilities Downloads: 2,114
- AccelerateCT Page views: 2,603
- Guidance Regarding Special Education Recovery for Students with IEPs due to the COVID-19 Pandemic Downloads: 19

While quantitative metrics data reviewed to evaluate the outcome of individuals accessing the electronic repository of resources developed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 showed that a high number of individuals viewed or downloaded this information over the past 12 months, qualitative data in the form of stakeholder input yielded additional valuable information regarding the topics and content of the resources posted this past year. Feedback on the resources was received from a diverse group of individuals including district administrators and teachers, parents, parent advocates and attorneys throughout the state and suggests that the newly developed resources were generally regarded as timely, appropriate, accessible, and practical. Although the ever-changing educational landscape provided a challenge in finalizing and releasing some of the guidance quickly, CSDE staff members worked extremely hard to be responsive to the immediate needs of the state's school districts and will continue to work to provide helpful guidance and resource documents moving forward.

Ongoing Professional Learning

Several activities were planned during the FFY 2020 as part of ongoing PL activities. The following list highlights the PL offerings from this improvement strategy and the associated metrics illustrate the short-term outcomes that were achieved.

Nine online webinars were made available to districts and one online module was made available to EPPs in the FFY 2020 school year. In total, 1,840

participants attended these online sessions, from 01/01/21 to 12/31/21. Below is a breakdown of total participants for each online offering.

1. Increasing Awareness of SLD/Dyslexia: Implications for CT Educators: 362
2. Using Literacy Screening Data to Support Students with Reading Difficulties: 167
3. Remediating and Accommodating Students with SLD/Dyslexia at the Secondary Level: 179
4. Identifying Students with SLD/Dyslexia: An Online Module: 24
5. It's Never Too Late: How to Motivate and Teach Older Struggling Readers with SLD/Dyslexia: 74
6. Case Study Review of a CT Student with SLD/Dyslexia: 101
7. SLD/Dyslexia: Connecting Research to Practice in Connecticut: 111
8. Identifying Students who are Gifted and Talented and Have SLD or SLD/Dyslexia: 57
9. Distinguishing Between Typically Developing English Learners and Students with Reading Difficulties: 57
10. Online Module for EPPs: 708

The Structured Literacy Series: "Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills," in which participants: defined and modeled strategies to teach students who have specific reading disabilities; identified skills needed to develop basic proficiency in reading and spelling; and learned the developmental progression of oral language skills that prepare students for reading proficiency, was offered across six cohorts in the FFY 2020 school year. In total, 177 special education teachers, general education teachers, administrators, literacy coaches and interventionists participated. They represented 50 public school districts (out of the state's 170 districts) as well as approved private schools, magnet and charter schools, the state's technical high school system, and colleges and universities.

The Structured Literacy Program Training Series provided sixteen training sessions during the FFY 2020 school year, fourteen trainings were made available virtually to district personnel across the state and two trainings were made available virtually to district personnel from districts that had been identified for continued TA and support through the State's SSIP work. In total, 502 participants attended these sessions. Below is a breakdown of total participants for each different training offered.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training (4 sessions): 111
2. Wilson – Just Words Virtual Launch Workshop (2 sessions): 38
3. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program (6 sessions): 186
4. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (2 sessions): 84
5. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking (2 sessions): 83

CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team

The DBI Leadership Team, consisting of BSE staff and researchers at UConn, are currently in the exploration phase. The exploration phase is carried out to ensure that all project activities will be perceived as acceptable and feasible to District and School DBI Team members implementing the DBI process. A member of the UConn Research Team ensures attention to and alignment of the CONNi4/DBI project with implementation science strategies. The DBI Leadership Team is in the process of recruiting districts for the CONNi4/DBI project. The DBI Readiness Assessment has been created, an initial survey was distributed to districts, responses have been analyzed, and an informational session has been scheduled to provide further information about this initiative.

In addition to the weekly DBI Leadership Team meetings and weekly UConn Research Team meetings, a presentation of the SSIP/SIMR and CONNi4/DBI project was made to the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group, State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), and CT's PTI Center to provide an overview and definition of DBI, share examples of each of the five DBI steps, and review plans for the CONNi4 project. Feedback provided by the stakeholders is being used to further inform our planning.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

SSIP Leadership Team

A key infrastructure improvement strategy for successful SSIP implementation and evaluation will be the continuous enhancement of intra-agency collaboration. The BSE's joint efforts with colleagues in the Academic, Turnaround, and Performance Offices, as well as the Office of Student Supports will continue to be critical in supporting districts in providing effective reading instruction to SWDs in grades K-3 in the upcoming year.

Considering the reading needs of SWDs during the Alliance District improvement planning meetings as well as promoting the disaggregation of data by specific subgroups will help to ensure that the district-level work targeted for the SIMR is embedded into the greater improvement efforts of the districts and not viewed as a separate, burdensome requirement. It is anticipated that a BSE staff member will attend planning meetings, review Alliance District applications, and act as a liaison with the Turnaround Office is expected to continue as a priority during the next reporting period.

After living through the experiences of the past year, special attention will need to be given to the social and emotional well-being of our students. Many students throughout the state have experienced personal and family health issues and deaths, housing and food insecurity, disengagement from the school community and challenges with participation in remote instruction. In order for students to be available to learn and make academic progress, a holistic approach to assessing, understanding, and appropriately addressing their social and emotional needs will be necessary during the upcoming year and potentially thereafter. SWDs may require more support in this area than their typical peers and focused intra-agency collaboration between the Office of Student Supports and the BSE will be important to the outcome of creating useful resources and supporting district staff in this area.

Online TA and Resource Library

The expansion of the Web-based repository to include new SSIP resources, as well as additional resources as determined by the SSIP Leadership Team, and through other intra-agency meetings, will continue into the FFY 2021 school year.

Ongoing Professional Learning

During the FFY 2021, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, will continue to make available for free the nine online webinars to districts statewide, as well as the online webinar for EPPs. In addition, the CSDE, in collaboration with the RESC Alliance, will sponsor another six cohorts of the series: "Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills" during the FFY 2021 school year. Finally, as part of its Structured Literacy Program Training Series, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, will provide the following sixteen training sessions during the FFY 2021 school year.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training: 5 sessions
2. Wilson – Just Words Virtual Launch Workshop: 2 sessions
3. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program: 5 sessions
4. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech: 2 sessions

- 5. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking: 1 session
- 6. Lindamood Bell Seeing Stars: 1 session

CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team

The CONNi4/DBI project is a multi-year initiative between the CSDE and UConn. The DBI Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly through the end of the 2020-21 school year. DBI will launch with the first cohort of districts and schools during the 2022-23 school year, and the second cohort of districts and schools during the 2023-24 school year. By the next reporting period, we will have identified six schools from three districts (2 schools per district) to participate in the first cohort of the CONNi4/DBI project. These districts will complete an interview to determine their readiness for DBI implementation. The interview consists of items adapted from a readiness assessment developed by the National Center for Intensive Intervention. It will allow the DBI Leadership Team to learn more about the district and school-based team members, the infrastructure established to approach data-based decision-making, and how quantitative data about student progress are used when implementing research-based reading interventions. This will further inform team planning for the next stage of implementation science, preparation. The preparation phase for the first cohort will begin following the readiness assessment. This will consist of the District DBI Leadership Team and School DBI Team members participating in training on how to implement the DBI process and how to use the web-based application to support with DBI implementation. The DBI Leadership Team will work with schools to collect baseline data before the implementation of the DBI initiative. When the DBI implementation phase begins, a DBI Coaching Cycle will also be initiated. This will include a series of meetings at first led by the UConn Coaches, then after a gradual release of responsibility, led by the School DBI Team, with support from the UConn Coach as needed. Additionally, the DBI Leadership Team will analyze statewide summative assessment results for third grade students with disabilities, in addition to the student-level data from universal screening and progress monitoring assessments gathered through the DBI process.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Connecticut Literacy Model

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-Based Practices

CONNi4/Data-based individualization (DBI)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), have worked to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including students with disabilities and English Learners.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy.

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4 project implements data-based individualization (DBI). DBI is a specific way of implementing intensive intervention using a five-step process that involves intervention, progress monitoring, and adaptation. In step 1, a research-based secondary prevention program is used. The program should be (a) validated by rigorous experimental studies; (b) implemented with groups of students who have not responded to secondary prevention; and (c) one used for secondary prevention but—in DBI—at the student's instructional level. Initially, interventionists provide small-group or individual instruction with only those adjustments agreed upon in collaboration with the school team. In step 2, progress monitoring is used to track student response to the intervention. Progress monitoring assessments should be (a) general outcome measures (usually) with reliability and validity for target skills; (b) done weekly or more frequently; and (c) used for secondary prevention but—in DBI—is at the student's instructional level. Progress should be evaluated relative to an aimline based on a pre-defined goal and adequate based on tracking the aimline. In step three, diagnostic assessment data are examined. These data include standardized assessments, teacher-made tests, and observations. Discussion focuses on how the data might reveal issues in the dimensions of the taxonomy. Step 4 involves the creation of a student-specific intensive intervention plan. During the meeting, the school-based team agrees on a plan that is based on the examination of the diagnostic assessment data, focuses on one or more areas of the taxonomy, and includes the ideas most likely to increase achievement. In step 5, the plan developed is implemented, student response to the intervention is tracked, and the school team cycles back to step 3 as needed. The interventionist implements the plan and tracks the student's progress closely, meeting with the school team every 4-6 weeks to evaluate the student's performance data relative to the student's aimline. If progress is adequate, then intervention is continued as is and if the progress is inadequate, the team returns to step 3.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), have worked to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, which directly supports the State's SSIP and SiMR.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy, which supports the State's SSIP work and SiMR. Below are examples of two of the trainings offered by the CSDE.

1. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program: The program introduces the rationale for providing structured literacy instruction and the O-G Approach, which is based on best practices. Educators receive training in the components of language that underlie reading acquisition and a scope and sequence of instructional approaches appropriate for struggling learners.

2. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training: This course provides participants with an overview of the Wilson Reading System (WRS) 4th Edition curriculum. The course examines how WRS addresses the teaching of phonemic awareness, word identification, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension through an integrated study of phonology, morphology, and orthography with students in grade 2 and above with persistent phonological coding deficits.

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4 project implements the DBI process through explicit, systematic, and strategic training and support for the participating districts and schools in the cohort. By the next reporting period, the six schools from three districts (2 schools per district) will have received training on how to implement the DBI process and use the web-based application to support the DBI implementation. A DBI Coaching Cycle will be initiated, which includes a series of meetings. At the initial meeting, the UConn Coach will review the DBI process with the School DBI Team and work with the school on the selection of students. At the next meeting, student progress monitoring data will be discussed along with adaptations to the intervention. The UConn Coach will provide modeling throughout the first and second meeting. The third meeting consists of reviewing the adaptations made to the student intervention and discussing implementation fidelity. After this meeting, the UConn Coach begins completing site visits to monitor implementation fidelity. At the fourth meeting, the School DBI Team discusses if additional students may benefit from DBI. The School DBI Team leads this meeting with support from the UConn Coach. At the fifth meeting, the DBI Coaching Cycle begins for a new student, and the School DBI Team will lead this meeting along with all other meetings in this DBI Coaching Cycle, with support from the UConn Coach. The DBI process will support the progress of the State's SiMR through this intensive intervention implementation initiative.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Connecticut's Literacy Model

CK-3LI was evaluated through a series of rigorous research studies that meet the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) evidence standards and recommendations for selecting evidence-based practices. Results indicated statistically significant impact on measures of phonemic awareness, word reading, and reading fluency with increasing effects across years of implementation. Results suggest that Connecticut's Literacy Model had a strong impact on key reading outcomes of students in participating schools and that impacts increased over multiple years of implementation.

Ongoing Professional Learning

The evaluation of professional learning opportunities is ongoing. In total, 502 participants attended these sessions. Participants responded to evaluation prompts as follows:

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training

As a result of this session, I have increased my knowledge and skills: 73% strongly agree; 27% agree.

The information was useful and relevant and will assist with informing my practice: 91% strongly agree; 9% agree.

2. Wilson – Just Words Virtual Launch Workshop

As a result of this session, I have increased my knowledge and skills: 56% strongly agree; 44% agree.

The information was useful and relevant and will assist with informing my practice: 67% strongly agree; 33% agree.

3. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program

The information will be useful in my work: 63% strongly agree; 26% agree; 8% neutral; 3% disagree.

4. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech

As a result of this session, I have increased my knowledge and skills: 100% strongly agree

The information was useful and relevant and will assist with informing my practice: 83% strongly agree; 17% agree.

5. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking

As a result of this session, I have increased my knowledge and skills: 79% strongly agree; 21% agree.

The information was useful and relevant and will assist with informing my practice: 79% strongly agree; 21% agree.

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4/DBI project is a multi-year initiative between the CSDE and UConn. DBI will launch with the first cohort of districts and schools during the 2022-23 school year, and the second cohort of districts and schools during the 2023-24 school year. By the next reporting period, we will have identified six schools from three districts (2 schools per district) to participate in the first cohort of the CONNi4/DBI project. The DBI Leadership Team will have analyzed statewide summative assessment results for third grade students with disabilities, in addition to the student-level data from universal screening and progress monitoring assessments gathered through the DBI process.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The USED approved the CSDE's request to waive accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-21 school year. The SIMR data are directly derived from the State's approved ESSA Accountability Index. Consequently, there are no FFY 2020 data available for this report. See "Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change." above for a summary of data collected during FFY 2020.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), will continue to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, which directly supports the State's SSIP and SiMR.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy, which supports the State's SSIP work and SiMR.

CONNi4/DBI Project

DBI will launch with the first cohort of districts and schools during the 2022-23 school year, and the second cohort of districts and schools during the 2023-24 school year. By the next reporting period, we will have identified six schools from three districts (2 schools per district) to participate in the first

cohort of the CONN4/DBI project. Additionally, the DBI Leadership Team will have analyzed statewide summative assessment results for third grade students with disabilities, in addition to the student-level data from universal screening and progress monitoring assessments gathered through the DBI process, as well as implementation fidelity data from participants in Cohort 1.

As implementation in the six schools from three districts (2 schools per district) who are part of Cohort 1 is underway, new districts will be recruited for Cohort 2. The participants in Cohort 2 will undergo the same project activities as the participants in Cohort 1. We will make any necessary modifications to DBI initiative activities based on all the information learned and data gathered throughout the initial iteration.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

- The CSDE Special Education Division Director held a series of introductory informational sessions with the following groups: SEPTO (Special Education Parent Teacher Organization), SEEK (Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut), AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Parents of Children with Disabilities), and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).
- A broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in a series of live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Participants were given access to the online learning platform CANVAS which contained multiple resources. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys.
- Youth Advisory Council students attended a virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Twenty students attended with educators from five school districts. Input was received in the form of live questions, instant polls, Mentimeter, and Padlet. Additionally, SPP/APR content and progress updates are incorporated in the planning and programming of the Youth Advisory Council activities prior to, during, and after the submission of the SPP/APR.
- Virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, instant polls, and small group discussions.
- A series of four virtual meetings were held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Two sessions were held for English speaking families and two sessions were held for Spanish speaking families. CPAC, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center, also developed SPP/APR content and opportunities for regular progress updates into the content and structure of the Parent Leadership group.
- Two virtual meetings were held with the Commissioner's RoundTable on Parent Engagement and the LEA Advisory Council. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments and small group discussions.
- The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with monthly updates: August through January.
- The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were utilized to share/disseminate information.
- Resources developed/posted to support capacity building understanding of the SPP/APR process: IDC Indicator Resources, CSDE developed infographic, CSDE website, recorded presentations.
- Stakeholder surveys were posted on CANVAS and the CSDE website.

The input and feedback received from these documented mechanisms was applied to our data targets. Based upon a review and analysis of previous indicator data for results-based indicators, the stakeholders were provided with a variety of options to consider. Their collective feedback was received, reviewed, and considered in setting targets. Revisions were made to address new data, calculated for 2020. Indicator 3 and 14 baselines were lowered slightly based upon analysis of the new data to establish 2020 targets, however the CSDE maintained the trajectory established by our stakeholders for targets across subsequent years. Indicator 17 (SSIP) was addressed within this stakeholder process.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Online TA and Resource Library

The CSDE employed multiple strategies to engage stakeholders with regard to the key improvement efforts that occurred during FFY 2020. As the COVID-19 pandemic continued, novel approaches such as the use of virtual meetings and webinars to facilitate stakeholder engagement were utilized over the past year.

- The Commissioner's Round Table, a diverse group of stakeholders, attended a series of virtual meetings and were asked to actively participate in the development of several guidance documents including: Sensible Assessment Practices for 2020-21 and Beyond; Adapt, Advance, Achieve: Connecticut's Plan to Learn and Grow Together, and AccelerateCT.
- The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC), the State's PTI Center, attended a series of virtual meetings to provide input in several guidance documents including: Addendum 3: Fall Reopening Resource Document for Students with High Needs, Addendum 6: Reopening Guidance for Educating Students with Disabilities, and Guidance Regarding Special Education Recovery for Students with IEPs due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Additionally, in conjunction with the CPAC, hosted multiple webinars for families regarding the education of students with disabilities during the 2020-21 school year.
- Other stakeholder activities that occurred during FFY 2020 included bi-weekly meetings with a special education advocacy group; weekly meeting with the Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE) Executive Board; monthly sessions with Regional ConnCASE Directors; and State Advisory Council on Special Education presentations and updates. Engaging in meaningful dialogues with these groups helped to inform the content of BSE guidance and the development of resources for the online library.

Legislation

Another stakeholder activity that occurred during FFY 2020 was the SA 19-8 Dyslexia Task Force. This group, comprised of representatives from the CSDE, institutes of higher education and teacher preparation programs, legislators, school district administrators, advocates, parents, and experts in dyslexia, was charged with analyzing and making recommendations on issues relating to the implementation of the laws governing dyslexia instruction and training in the state. BSE staff attended four virtual meetings in FFY 2019 and four virtual meetings in FFY 2020, as well as participated in subcommittee work, which resulted in a report of recommendations and potential legislative changes for the state. The CSDE worked with the Dyslexia

Task Force and legislators on the recommendations identified in the Task Force's report, which resulted in PA 21-168: An Act Implementing the Recommendations of the Task Force to Analyze the Implementation of Laws Governing Dyslexia Instruction and Training, effective July 1, 2021. This legislation establishes the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities within the CSDE and makes changes to state laws governing educator preparation programs, teacher certification, and K-3 reading assessments. PA 21-2 (June Special Session) also changes the law regarding K-3 reading assessments and establishes the Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success within the CSDE.

SiMR/SSIP and CONNi4/DBI

In addition to the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group, which met throughout the year to assist the BSE in setting targets all IDEA Part B indicators, including Indicator 17: SSIP, the BSE also obtained feedback regarding the SSIP and SiMR from the Connecticut State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC).

The CSDE formed a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) stakeholder group to assist the agency with the development of Phase One of the SSIP. This group (described in the state's SSIP Phase One submission) provided the State with the expertise and diverse perspectives needed for planning and development. Since the submission of Phase One, the CSDE has been using the SAC as its primary stakeholder group for input (including the resetting of targets), feedback and dissemination of information related to the SSIP. SAC members must be individuals involved in, or concerned with the education of children with disabilities; and representative of the ethnic and racial diversity of, and the types of disabilities found in, the state population.

The SSIP Leadership Team and the UConn DBI Leadership Team prepared a presentation to deliver during the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group and SAC Indicator 17: SSIP Meeting. The presentation provided an overview of data-based individualization (DBI), defined the DBI process, provided examples of each of the five DBI steps, and shared the plans for the Connecticut Intensive Intervention Implementation Initiative (CONNi4) project. After the presentation, there were opportunities for the stakeholders to ask questions or write comments in the chat. Additionally, a survey was made available to all participants and allowed them to confidentially share feedback and comments. Items on the survey included (a) additional questions stakeholders still had about DBI and the CONNi4 project, (b) an opportunity to share how they felt the CONNi4 project would contribute to supporting the SSIP goal to increase the reading performance of all third grade students with disabilities, (c) outcomes from the CONNi4 project that they are most interested in learning more about, and (d) how they would like to receive ongoing updates about the CONNi4 project.

Furthermore, as part of the CONNi4 project, an Advisory Board has been established, which shall meet twice annually to provide feedback concerning the project's activities and its implementation design. The Advisory Board shall include teachers, administrators, and experts on intervention, progress monitoring, DBI implementation, and implementation science.

Work with stakeholders on the State Board of Education's five year strategic plan will likely address reading achievement for all students with an emphasis on equity and closing the achievement gap for SWDs.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Online TA and Resource Library

Similar themes have been identified by the various stakeholder groups that have been convened to support districts in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, while schools are operating within three instructional learning models. Those themes have included: staffing and transportation; student attendance and engagement; the unique challenges for high needs students, minority and/or low income students and their families; the accessibility, quality, and fidelity of remote instruction; and the continuity and quality of service delivery across multiple instructional models. The BSE addressed these concerns expressed by stakeholders in the development of guidance, resources, professional learning opportunities, which were added to the Online TA and Resource Library.

Legislation

Many of the recommendations of the SA 19-8 Dyslexia Task Force, resulted legislation that establishes the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities within the CSDE and makes changes to state laws governing educator preparation programs, teacher certification, and K-3 reading assessments. Additionally, PA 21-2 (June Special Session) also changes the law regarding K-3 reading assessments and establishes the Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success within the CSDE.

SiMR/SSIP and CONNi4/DBI

During the SPP/APR Stakeholder Group/SAC Indicator 17: SSIP Meeting, concerns from stakeholders were taken into account in the setting of new SSIP targets. Additionally, several themes were identified by various stakeholders regarding the CONNi4 project and the DBI process. One theme shared amongst stakeholders was the importance of communicating with parents at the onset and throughout the DBI process regarding their child, including informing parents of their child's progress monitoring data; sharing with parents the specific intervention their child receives and how it addresses reading foundational skills, so they can support their child at home; including parents in the School DBI Team discussions regarding their child, so they are full, equal, and equitable partners in their child's education; and sharing information about the DBI process. Another theme discussed by stakeholders was if DBI would be accessible to all students with disabilities (i.e., students who are blind, visually impaired, or deaf-blind, students with emotional or behavioral issues, and students who are English Learners). A third theme related to the implementation of DBI, including: fidelity and feasibility, the importance of selecting both rural and urban districts for the cohort, and the potential for the CONNi4 project to be scaled up. The SSIP Leadership Team and UConn DBI Leadership Team address all questions, comments, and concerns raised during the meeting.

Materials will be developed specifically for families about DBI and the DBI process to allow parents to fully understand and be informed about the process. The SSIP Leadership Team and the UConn DBI Leadership Team will work with the SAC, the CPAC, and the DBI Advisory Board in the development of the DBI Family Materials. The DBI training provided to schools/districts in the Cohort will contain information on how to involve families in the DBI process, and how to use the DBI Family Materials to promote family engagement. The SSIP Leadership Team and UConn DBI Leadership Team will provide regular updates to the SAC on the status of the CONNi4 project by email and at future meetings.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

CT IEP Quality Training

New IEP document and the CT Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS)

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

CT IEP Quality Training

- Background: During the 2020-21 school year, the BSE worked with the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to develop the CT IEP Quality Training materials. The CT IEP Quality Training was piloted in Fall 2021. Revisions were made to the materials, based on feedback from the pilot. The CT IEP Quality Training was launched statewide in Winter 2022 to “train the trainers” and build state and district capacity. The CT IEP Quality Training is comprised of eight segments: IEP Basics, Present Levels of Performance, Measurable Goals and Objectives Part I, Measurable Goals and Objectives Part II, Supplementary Aids and Services, Secondary Transition, Special Education Service Delivery, and Progress Monitoring in the IEP. Participants in the CT IEP Quality Training will be able to understand how the IEP components create cohesive programs for students with disabilities; develop quality IEPs that (a) are grounded in a student’s present levels of performance; (b) have aligned, rigorous, and measurable goals and objectives; and (c) have established progress monitoring processes; describe how educators in different roles contribute to the IEP development process; and understand how the IEP is documented in the new CT IEP form/CT-SEDS.
- Timeline: During the summer following the 2021-22 school year, revisions will be made to the training materials, based on feedback from the state and district trainers. During the 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 school years, the CT IEP Quality Training will continue being implemented statewide. The CSDE is committed to a cycle of continuous evaluation and improvement of the materials and trainings throughout the implementation.
- Anticipated data collection and measures: Evaluation data will be collected from participants in the pilot, state and district trainers, and all participants in the statewide training, including, but not limited to, school and district administrators, special education leaders, special educators and related services personnel, general educators, approved private special education programs, state agency personnel, institutes of higher education, parents, advocacy groups, and youth.
- Expected outcomes that relate to SiMR: The CT IEP Quality Training will build statewide capacity in not only developing quality IEPs that are not only grounded in a student’s present levels of performance, have aligned, rigorous, and measurable goals and objectives, and have established progress monitoring processes, but will build capacity to better identify a student’s unique needs, design, implement, and monitor the specially-designed instruction and evidence-based interventions for each student, ultimately, improving instruction for and the performance of students with disabilities.

New IEP document and the CT-SEDS

- Background: In the 2018-19, the BSE began work with both an internal team and an external stakeholder group to develop the new IEP document in CT; stakeholder comments were open through October 2019. In September 2020, the CSDE entered into a partnership with the Public Consulting Group (PCG) to support its goals and vision of developing a comprehensive statewide Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS) to make available to all of its local school district partners. CT-SEDS adaptive electronic IEP document is being designed to improve format and flow of information with intuitive, easy to use displays. The new system will include a parent portal for families to access their student’s IEP and other important information as well as a language translation feature to ensure that parents receive information in their native language. The new and improved document will also assist PPTs in navigating the special education process, leading to the development of high quality IEPs for Connecticut’s students. During the 2020-21 school year, the BSE worked with PCG to design the CT-SEDS. The CT-SEDS Pilot Training was launched in Winter 2022.
- Timeline: During the spring of the 2021-22 school year, revisions will be made to the CT-SEDS, based on feedback from the pilot. The BSE is planning to implement the new IEP document and the CT-SEDS statewide in the 2022-23 school year. CT-SEDS Training will continue statewide through the 2024-25 school year, with ongoing technical support, as needed.
- Anticipated data collection and measures: In addition to the IEP Module, the CT-SEDS will also have a Services Plan Module, Section 504 Accommodation Plan Module, Gifted and Talented Module, and a Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Module. Data from the IEP Module, including Progress Reports, as well as data from the MTSS Module will be collected to determine the ELA performance of students with and without disabilities on progress monitoring measures.
- Expected outcomes that relate to SiMR: The year-to-year analysis of the achievement for students with disabilities will be used as a factor in determining the effectiveness of instruction and interventions, as well as the need for additional professional learning and technical assistance.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

- New CSDE staff assigned to SSIP work – participate in informational webinars/calls with OSEP and NCSI staff
- CSDE staff/time to commit to current plan – assess current proposed staffing assignments and consider the need to revise the current SSIP implementation methodology
- Scaling up professional learning activities for SSIP – consider increasing the role of other organizations to address SSIP professional learning support
- Ability to sustain current intra-agency partnerships – continue to expand current levels of communication and collaboration throughout the calendar year

The State has benefitted from both the virtual and in-person technical assistance opportunities provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and appreciates this additional support. We plan to continue our involvement with the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Collaborative and engage with other states in an effort to best support the SSIP and the reading achievement of students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

17 - Required Actions

The State did not provide data for FFY 2020. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Chief State School Officer

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Bryan Klimkiewicz

Title:

State Special Education Director

Email:

bryan.klimkiewicz@ct.gov

Phone:

18606558217

Submitted on:

04/28/22 10:34:07 AM